THE FIREMAN

A SOCIOLOGICAL PROFILE

HENRY J. DEAKIN

UNIVERSITY OF SALFORD

MAY, 1975

C O N T E N T S

= = = = = = = = = = =
= = = = = = =
= =

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

= = = = = = = = = = = =
= = = = = = =
= =

PREFACE

This research is a study of firemen working in an English city.   Broadly the aim of the study is to investigate the attitudes of these firemen towards their work.   The contributions of industrial sociologists to the analysis of work situations are evaluated.   The patterns of recruitment into the Brigade, in relation to the impact of the previous work experience are discussed.   It is shown that previous work experience is often an important determinant of orientation to existing work.   The work tasks of the firemen are described and so are their attitudes to these tasks.   It is demonstrated that the city firemen had a 'crisis orientation' to their work. The question is asked: "Why do emergencies give meaning?" The patterns of sociability and leisure of the firemen are also analysed and the findings presented in the general context of the impact of work upon non-work life.

= = = = = = = = = = =

I. HISTORICAL APPRAISAL AND THE FIRE SERVICE TODAY

Introduction.

A fireman is a specialist in dealing with emergency situations.   The fireman is required to deal with an emergency quickly before it gets out of hand.   The act of dealing with an emergency is therefore very much a time-constrained activity. One consequence of this has been that the fireman,(1) unlike the doctor, plumber, social worker, nurse, or detective, has not been able, in the past, to build up a continuous flow of intrinsically interesting worthwhile "less immediate", "less time constrained" "other roles" which can be performed when "the pressure is off". It is time constrained emergency situations which are regarded, by the firemen, as being the most worthwhile part of the working role, and as fires do not occur "to order", but are completely "unordered" the role is perceived by the firemen as being discontinuous.   The work profile consists of the alternation of long periods of relatively "unworthwhile" "untimeconstrained" "dull" routine tasks and short periods of "exciting" "worthwhile" "time constrained" emergency operations.

Firemen are likely to judge the frequency of emergencies from the point of view of an insider closely involved with emergency situations.   If the emergencies do not come they are missed especially in smaller county stations where they are less frequent:

"It can get very boring as this is a rural station. I like the calls, its what you get paid for."

---

(1)   The position has recently been altered as firemen now carry out fire prevention duties during non-operational periods and many of them find this kind of activity enjoyable.

"We don't get so many fires. I feel better when I have been out."

A fireman from one of the city stations said:

"Relationships tend to stray when there are few fires. You get a big fire and it fetches them all together and they seem friendly. In the quiet spells there is nothing to talk about."

Historical Development.

I propose now to briefly discuss the events leading up to the development of organized fire fighting. Fires in themselves are not a new problem. The Anglo-Saxons, for instance, living in their small settlements, did not have any system of organized fire control (though it is likely that the Romans did). Up until the Middle Ages little real effort was made to organize fire fighting on an effective basis. What usually happened in a large fire was a somewhat sporadic effort to gather buckets, ladders and fire hoses together. At the Great Fire of London hand squirts were used but could not control the fire; two hundred thousand people lost their homes and they had to camp outside the city; eighty-nine of the hundred churches, including St. Paul's, were burnt out. The consequences were that London was rebuilt, mostly with brick and stone rather than with wood. The first Insurance Company was set up by merchants in 1680. From this time on the Insurance Companies increased their numbers. 'The Sun', 'The Phoenix', 'The Hand-in-Hand', 'The Protector' and 'The Eagle' are famous examples. These companies formed their own brigades. If a fire broke out the brigades of the different companies would turn out. Usually each brigade would

only tackle a fire in a house that had their firemark on the wall.

Edinburgh was the first city to have its own fire brigade (1824). James Braidwood was appointed fire master. The London Fire Establishment was started in 1832 with Braidwood again in charge. He was killed in a large fire in Tooley Street in 1861 and Captain Massey Shaw was appointed in his place. In 1865 the Municipal Authority took over the most of the London Brigade - the Insurance Companies having decided that they could no longer afford to pay for the service. Some other towns and cities continued with insurance brigades and with police and volunteer brigades. The number of municipal brigades, however, slowly increased.

Different types of brigades continued to co-exist alongside each other up till the First World War. The War itself brought little change to fire fighting except it did result in some attempt at co-ordination of public and private provisions. This co-ordination was not particularly successful mainly because the equipment of the different brigades was not interchangeable. In 1938 recommendations were put forward that local authorities should be responsible for the organization of fire cover. The recommendations were accepted and were embodied in the Fire Brigades Act of 1938, which applied to England, Wales and Scotland and was the first Act that required local authorities to set up their own fire brigades. The Act was overtaken by world events. The Second World War meant that the Act was not fully implemented. In 1941, to meet wartime needs, the service was nationalised, and it was 1947 before it was returned to local authority control. The National Fire Service was ended and the brigades were grouped to correspond with the area of 150 of the larger councils. After 1947 there

were two types of brigade - county and county borough.   In 19474
the boundaries were changed in phase with the local government
reorganization and the number of brigades was considerably
reduced.

The Fire Service Today.

Today the Fire Service is not a 'big' employer of labour;
Great Britain is protected from fire by about 26,000 firemen.
There are a large number of fire stations and these are spread
throughout the country.   This means that the size of the working
groups employed in each station is fairly small - at least by
'factory' standards.   Cities and intensively 'built-up' areas
need more firemen, area for area, to give adequate fire protection
than country and small town areas.   The size of station in the
cities is therefore often larger than in other sreas.   However,
this does not alter the general fact that the overall size of
working groups remains small.   It is a large station that is
manned by more than 100 firemen.

Firemen are distributed roughly according to the
relative 'density' of emergencies in each area.   Areas with
very few calls need fewer firemen and operate a different kind
of duty system.   Ordinary firemen, with whom I am primarily
concerned, (19,000 of the 26,000 firemen occupy the rank of
ordinary fireman) work three principal duty systems -
the 56 hour week, the 48 hour week and the Day Manning System.

The 56 hour system requires 3 watches.   Normally there
is a nine hour day and a fifteen hour night shift.   The typical
roster provides either for 3 day shifts, 3 night shifts and
3 days rostered leave (3/3/3) or for 2 days each (2/2/2).   Over

Over 7 cycles, i.e. 6 or 9 weeks, the weekly average is 56 hours.[1]

The 48 hour system works in a more complex way. The men are normally divided into seven groups, each of which is on duty with one other at any one time but not always the same one.[2]

There is considerable variation in the way in which day manning is operated. The men spend between 35 and 45 day time hours at the station or elsewhere on duty, and the balance of the 56 hour week at home 'on call'. In addition, there is an obligation to accept retained duties for an extra period which can be up to a further 56 hours a week. For these firemen are paid a retaining fee and also turn-out and attendance fees if they are called out.[3]

Throughout the Fire Service the 56-hour week is the predominant duty system worked. Of a total of 26,000 men of all ranks (excluding control room staff) over three-quarters are employed on this system. [4] Nearly eight per cent of the service work the 48-hour system and about four to five per cent work the day manning system. Thirteen per cent of those below Sub-Officer level in the English and Welsh County Brigades work this system. [5] The day manning system is in operation in rural and semi-rural areas because only one watch is needed instead of three.

I have already mentioned the fact that the more worth-while part of the job as seen by the fireman is 'discontinuous'.

----

(1)   The 'Report of the Cunningham Inquiry into the Work of the Fire Service', Chairman: Sir Charles Cunningham, London, H.M.S.O., 1971, page 14.

(2)   Ibid.,

(3)   Ibid.,   (4) Ibid.,   (5) Ibid.,

The act of turning out to a fire is very much a time-constrained activity and the fireman has little opportunity to build up a predictable reserve of intrinsic interesting worthwhile jobs. The intrinsically interesting emergencies cannot be "ordered" or predicted by the fireman - the fireman has to deal with them as they come.   The "immediate" characteristics of the emergency situation have the effect of making a very clear distinction between "operational" and "non-operational" time. The routine nature of much non-operational work has been emphasized by different writers.

The Cunningham Inquiry argues that firemen "find satisfaction in dealing with emergencies but these are relatively infrequent, especially at quiet stations.   At other times the work of the fireman is often routine and unskilled.   This has important consequences for the fireman's job satisfaction;   on the one hand, there are emergency situations in which his skills and initiative are fully used and he is able to regard himself as a skilled worker doing a public service;   on the other hand there are long periods at the station between calls of which a great part is occupied in cleaning and other routine and unskilled work well below his true level of skill and ability.[1]

L.F. Hobley argues that a fireman "may have to spend weeks just watching and waiting.   The cleaning of equipment day after day seems endless;   it is boring and hardly seems worthwhile.   But then the day comes when it is needed, when the care with which it has been tended means first class efficiency at a fire.   The boredom of waiting is forgotten in the absorption with difficult and dangerous work."[2]

----

(1)   Ibid., pages 24-25.

(2)   L.F. Hobley, 'The Fire Service', London, Allan and Sons, 1970, pages 24-25.

Table 1. 1 is taken from the Margaret Thomas Survey into the personnel of the Fire Service.   70% of the junior ranks interviewed thought that cleaning and station duties were a waste of time.   Table 1. 2 from the same source shows that 36% of the firemen thought that less time should be spent on cleaning and station duties.   Table 1. 3 indicates that the most worthwhile activity for the firemen was fire fighting itself.   Fire prevention work and visits to high risk areas were thought to be important by a minority only.

The Cunningham Report argued that firemen wanted a reduction in the amount of cleaning and other routine duties that had to be performed. [1]   The Report states that routine duties should be replaced by work which involved more skill, for example, fire prevention work.   While I was carrying out the field work for this dissertation the firemen I came into contact with were already receiving their first training in fire prevention work.   Cunningham's recommendations were being implemented.

----

[1] Op. cit., page 25.

TABLE 1. 1.

ACTIVITIES WHICH JUNIOR RANKS THOUGHT A WASTE OF TIME[*]

	%
CLEANING/STATION DUTIES	70
DRILLS	24
EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE	12
OFFICE/PAPER WORK	7
PARADE	6
LECTURES/STUDY PERIODS	4
CONTROL/WATCH ROOM DUTY	2
FIRE PREVENTION DUTY	2
COOKING/KITCHEN DUTY	1
OTHER	4
TOTAL	132 [**]

[**] Adds to more than 100% as some respondents mentioned more than one activity.

[*] Margaret Thomas 'The Fire Service and its Personnel', an Enquiry undertaken for the Home Office, London, H.M.S.O.,1969, page 24.

TABLE 1. 2

WAYS IN WHICH THE RUNNING OF THE STATION COULD BE IMPROVED[*]

	%
LESS TIME SPENT ON CLEANING/STATION DUTIES	36
MORE/BETTER TRAINING; DRILL; LECTURES	29
IMPROVEMENT IN RELATIONS BETWEEN OFFICERS AND MEN	28
MORE FIRE PREVENTION/VISITS TO FIRE RISKS	16
PHYSICAL IMPROVEMENTS TO THE STATION	9
IMPROVE SYSTEM OF WATCHES/DUTY SYSTEM	7
BETTER ORGANISATION OF WORK ROUTINE	7
SHOULD BE FEWER OFFICERS	6
EMPLOY MORE/DIFFERENT TYPE OF PERSONNEL	5
OTHER	32
TOTAL	175 [**]
% BASE (THOUGHT RUNNING OF STATION COULD BE IMPROVED)	993

[**] Adds to more than 100% as some respondents gave more
than one way in which the running of the Station
could be improved.

[*] M. Thomas, op cit., page 64.

TABLE 1. 3

ACTIVITIES WHICH THE JUNIOR RANKS THOUGHT MOST WORTH DOING [*]

	%
FIRE FIGHTING	53
HELPING PEOPLE	22
SAVING LIFE AND PROPERTY	20
TRAINING/DRILL	19
LECTURES/STUDYING	11
MACHINE/EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE	9
TURNOUTS	8
VISITS TO FACTORIES/HIGH RISK AREAS	6
SAVING/PROTECTING PROPERTY	5
FIRE PREVENTION WORK	5
HELPING/INSTRUCTING THE MEN	4
TOPOGRAPHY	2
OTHER	12
TOTAL	176 [**]
% BASE (ALL JUNIOR RANKS)	1,470

[**]   Adds to more than 100% as some respondents mentioned more than one activity.

[*]   M. Thomas, op cit., page 26.

TABLE 1. 4

PERCENTAGE OF TIME SPENT ON VARIOUS ACTIVITIES IN A SAMPLE OF STATIONS.[*]

Working Pattern	Brigade	Station	Drills	Cleaning & Maintenance	F.P. 1(i)d Visits, Hydrants	Study	Meals Standby	Other
			%	%	%	%	%	%
48-hour shift	A(City)	No.1	11.4	23.3			61.3	4.0(P.T.)[**]
"	A(City)	No.2	11.4	23.3			61.3	4.0(P.T.)
"	B(City)	No.1	8.2	← —— 91.8 —————————→				
"	B(City)	No.2	8.2	← ——— 91.8 ————————→				
56-hour shift	C(County)		12.9	25.8		4.5	52.4	4.4(P.T.)
"	D(County)		11.0	18.0			71.0	-
"	E(County)		8.3	24.0	12.5	-	55.2	-
"	F(City)	No.1	6.9	35.8			57.3	-
"	F(City)	No.2	6.9	35.8			57.3	-
"	G(County)		8.3	13.3			78.4	-
		Average	9.4	24.9			62.0	-
Day Manning	C		15.9	24.8		8.0	43.3	8.0(P.T.)
"	D		4.6	23.9			71.5	-
"	E		7.1	24.5	33.9	-	34.5	-
"	H(County)		7.8	25.0	12.5	-	51.6	3.1(P.T.)
"	G		12.1	← ———— 45.5 ————————→			42.4	-
		Average	9.4	24.8			56.9	

** Physical Training.   * Cunningham, op cit., page 20.

TABLE 1.5

TIME SPENT ON EMERGENCY CALLS AS A PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL TIME.

Station	Calls as per cent of total available man hours	Calls & maintenance time as per cent of total available man hours
	%	%
48-hour shift		
1 City	6.8	16.5
2 City	4.1	7.7
3 City	4.7	12.2
4 City	4.7	10.7
56-hour shift		
5 County	0.8	2.3
6 County	1.9	5.4
7 County	1.0	2.2
8 City	3.2	10.7
9 City	5.4	13.3
10 County	1.1	2.3
Average	3.3	8.3
Day manning		
11 County	4.0	10.9
12 County	2.9	5.2
13 County	1.0	2.4
14 County	-	-
15 County	1.3	3.6
Average	3.1	7.6
Range	0.8-6.8	2.2-16.5

Note: Day-manning figures have been expressed as calls received
and attended during normal duty hours.

• Cunningham, op. cit., page 21.

As will be obvious from Tables 1. 4 and 1.5 fire
fighting and emergency situations, as such, occupy only a small
percentage of the fireman's total working time. The Cunningham
Report gives the average figure as 3%. The infrequency of the
emergencies, as experienced subjectively by the firemen, may
then be a cause of job dissatisfaction for them. The frequency
of the "turn outs" is usually important since fire fighting
constitutes the primary task in the work role. The frequency
of fires varies very much from station to station depending on
whether the stations are situated in the city, the town or the
countryside.

= = = = = = = = = = =

II METHODOLOGY

The Action Approach.

Important differences of approach are often more a
consequence of the type of relationship the sociologist
generates into the group with which he is concerned than of
abstract theory as such.   In some cases the relationship may be
already existent, e.g. students of organization who also act as
consultants to management.[1]   As consultants, to some extent,
such students have already achieved a clearly defined status in
the organizations.   Other sociologists, not being in this position,
have to create a relationship which enables them to carry out
the research.   The methodology which is chosen may be directly
related to the type of relationship which is achieved.   To a
certain extent it is the case that every relationship requires its
own methodology and this is especially so in so far as sociologists,
unlike other scientists, do not control the object of their research.
A chemist, for instance, does not have to worry about a social
relationship with chemicals.   Provided the chemist obeys certain
laws the chemicals respond in a certain way.   The type of
relationship a sociologist creates with the context and subject of
his research will be influenced by the kind of situation he is in
in relation to the object of his research.   In some cases it may
be possible to join a group as a fully participating member for
the duration of the fieldwork.   In other cases, this is not
possible because the group establishes entry standards which the
sociologist may not possess.   If he does not possess them he may
not be able to achieve a 'satisfactory' (from a sociological
viewpoint) relationship.   There are also examples of

_ _

(1) D. Silverman, 'The Theory of Organizations', London,
Heinemann, 1970, page 122.

organizations and situations where the sociologist may be able to gain entry at a 'cost'.   The 'cost' will of course vary. I would like to consider the case of the Fire Service.   I could have participated as a fireman and have undergone the training necessary for entry.   In cases where the object of study is also the chosen career for the sociologist this would afford a satisfactory approach.   To have undertaken expensive training would, for myself, have been a 'breach of confidence'.   It is unlikely that I would have been accepted for such training purely on the basis of my role as 'researcher'.   Training is usually only given to those who wish to make the fire service their career.   I therefore decided that the best method would be to enter the organization as a guest, having fully explained my purpose to members of the Service.

It is now necessary for me to elaborate my methodological perspective with regard to what 'organization' itself represents. Silverman[1] has argued "All perspectives offer insights in exchange for limitations in approach'.   'A way of seeing' as Poggi[2] has put it 'is also a way of not seeing'.

My approach could be described as a 'Social Action' approach - I do not regard organizations as 'Systems' or as 'Socio-technical systems'.   This has not lead to the exclusion of 'macro' data from Government Reports which illuminate conditions in the Fire Service.   I hope the results present themselves not as methodological anomie, but rather as an example of trying to get the best of two approaches.   The two kinds of data have been kept separate in most cases.

- -

(1) Op cit.,   page 44.

(2) G. Poggi, 'A Main Theme of Contemporary Sociological
     Analysis: Its Achievements and Limitations', British
     Journal of Sociology, Vol. 16, pages 263-94.

The action approach itself deserves some discussion as it is by no means the only perspective from which organizations have been studied in the past.   Indeed the action approach poses problems for the sociologist.

The social action approach initially derives from Max Weber.   He argued that sociology is "a science which attempts the interpretative understanding of social action in order to arrive at a causal explanation of cause and effect."   In the term 'action' he included "all human behaviour when and in so far as the acting individual attaches a subjective meaning to it."[1]

Weber was aware that his own limitation of the term 'sociology' to the analysis of subjectively meaningful action cuts across other conceptions of the range of the field.

Interpretative sociology, according to Weber, does not involve the connotation that social phenomena can be explained reductively in psychological terms.   The sociologist is not interested in the psychological make-up of the individual 'per se' but in the interpretative analysis of social action.[2]

Many contemporary writers have adopted an action approach including Schutz[3], Berger [4], Goffman [5], and Cicourel[6]. Argyris has argued that Goldthorpe and Lockwood et al too, follow an action approach: "They are primarily concerned with behaviour

----

(1)   M. Weber, 'The Theory of Social and Economic Organisation',
       New York, Free Press, 1947, page 87.

(2)   A. Giddens, op. cit., page 151.

(3)   A. Schutz, 'Collected Papers', edited by M. Natanson,
       The Hague, Nijoff, 1964.

(4)   P.L. Berger and Luckmann, 'The Social Construction of Reality':
       A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge', New York,
       Doubleday, 1966.

(5)   E. Goffman, 'Asylums', Harmondsworth, Pelican, 1968.

(6)   A. Cicourel, 'Method and Measurement in Sociology',
       New York, Free Press, 1964.

which is both orientated towards and subjectively meaningful for the actor". [1]

This approach may be contrasted with the functionalist approach (also the 'systems' approach). The 'systems' or "transcendental" view of society in part derives its origins from E. Durkheim who argued that men are constrained by social facts which determine their actions and consciousness.

"A social fact is every way of acting, fixed or not, capable of exercising on the individual an external constraint; or again, every way of acting which is general throughout a given society, while at the same time existing in its own right independent of its individual manifestations". [2]

"It is very certain that there are in the living cell only molecules of crude matter. But these molecules are in contact with one another and this association is the cause of the new phenomena which characterise life, the very germ of which cannot possibly be found in the separate elements. A whole is not identical with the sum of its parts. It is something different, and its properties differ from those of its component parts". [3]

"When, then, the sociologist undertakes the investigation of some order of social facts, he must endeavour to consider them from an aspect which is independent of their individual manifestations". [4] "The determining cause of a social fact should be sought among the social facts preceding it and not among the states of individual consciousness". [5]

---

(1) C. Argyris, 'The Applicability of Organisational Sociology', Cambridge University Press, 1972, page 46.

(2) E. Durkheim, 'The Rules of the Sociological Method', London, Free Press, 1938.

(3) Op. cit., page 102.

(4) Ibid.,   page 45.

(5) Ibid.,   page 110.

Both Silverman [1] and Rex [2] have pointed out the defects
of 'systems' and 'functionalist' theories which use an organic
analogy to explain the nature of the relationship between system
parts.   Its usefulness depends on how far one is prepared to
concede that social institutions are similar to biological organisms
and that their functioning is best understood in terms of a series
of reactions to an often hostile environment.

Silverman argues that one of the reasons for the acceptance
of functionalism was that, at certain stages in the development
of sociology, there was a concern to demonstrate respectability of
the discipline because of a need to bolster their self-image or
to encourage the provision of research funds. [3]

Another approach which has been quite widely used by
organisational and industrial sociologists is the 'socio-technical
systems' approach.   This has much in common with the systems
approach and is seen most clearly from a recent work by Rice.
"This book seeks to establish a series of concepts and a theory
of organisation that treats enterprises as living organisms". [4]

Functionalism relying, as it does, on the organic analogy
has no adequate explanation of social change.   The analogy of the
organism is incomplete and unsatisfactory.   This is because the
analogy relates only to 'static' organisms which only exist at
one point in time.   A 'real' biological organism, however, is
born, grows to maturity, reproduces itself and, later, dies.
Functionalists seem to omit concern with reproduction and morphology.

----

(1)   D. Silverman, op cit.

(2)   J. Rex, 'Key Problems of Sociological Theory', London,
      Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1961.

(3)   D. Silverman, op. cit.,

(4)   A.K. Rice, 'The Enterprise and its Environment: A System
      Theory of Management Organisation'', London, Tavistock,
      1963, page 179.

Dahrendorf has argued: "Structural-functional analysis, as it stands today, fails to explain problems of change because it does not account for the peculiar character of social as opposed to organic structures. It does not look for the dynamic variables that, though operating within given structures, are in principle independent of their constructed functional integration".[1]

The functionalists model remains static depending for its validity on the supposed similarity of the relationships between the interdependent parts of an organism and the whole, and the interdependent parts of a society and the whole, at any given moment in time. Whatever goes on is viewed from the standpoint of the existing structure. Functionalists therefore only explain the consequence of change, but not the causes of change.

Silverman has explained the defects of the systems approach in the work of one of its more sophisticated exponents A. Etzioni[2] who developed a typology of types of involvement and power in organizations; it is to this typology that Silverman refers:

"Involvement of what Etzioni calls 'lower-level participants' may be calculative (implying a commitment of low intensity) moral, or alienative (a negative commitment of high intensity). Each type of involvement reflects a form of compliance with a particular variety of power and there is a strain towards congruent power/involvement types, e.g. isercive power/ alienative involvement, remunerative power/involvement. While this is a useful typology it is limited by a systems perspective which allows Etzioni to suggest that the strain towards congruence

---

(1)   R. Dahrendorf, 'Class and Class Conflict in an Industrial Society', London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, page 123.

(2)   A. Etzioni, 'Modern Organisations', New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, Foundations of Modern Sociology Series, 1964. 'A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations', New York, Free Press, 1961. 'Complex Organizations', A Sociological Reader, New York, Holt, 1961.

exists because congruent types are more effective'. [1]

There would be a problem with using a 'systems' approach in a many tiered organization like the Fire Service.   Individual units (the stations) have a considerable degree of autonomy from the 'Fire Service' as a whole.   If the 'system' is located at the highest level the resources required in analysis and research would be beyond any one sociologist.   However, the 'system' can also be located at brigade or station level.   The sociologist then has to justify why his particular choice of 'system' represents the REAL system.   A case can be made for locating the 'system' at any one of a number of levels.

The action approach, by not insisting upon the unit of study representing a system, allows for greater flexibility and legitimacy in the design of the research.   The choice of the action approach does not of itself, however, resolve the issue of which groups within the large organization may be most relevant in the research.   Glazer and Strauss argue that before generation of a substantive theory the sociologist should establish the basic categories by minimising the differences between comparative groups.   Once the basic work is accomplished, however, the sociologist should turn to maximising differences among comparative groups in accordance with the kind of theory he wants to develop. [2]

In the pilot pre-research study of county and small town fire stations I did not follow this procedure, however. The stations were small with only ten firemen or thereabouts in

---

(1)   Op. cit., page 177.

(2)   B.G. Glaser and A.L. Strauss, 'The Discovery of Grounded Theory', London, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1968, pages 55-58.

each unit and there were considerable differences in the way the

stations were organized. Moreover there were not enough firemen

in each station to develop firm theoretical categories. I was

'maximizing' differences before having adequately 'minimized'

them and I decided that this was the wrong approach to the problem.

Therefore I concentrated interviewing resources in the main study

on just two stations within one brigade. [1] These two stations

together made up the brigade. The differences between the two

stations were not so great that they jeopardized the minimizing

procedure. [2]

As already stated, the greatest percentage of firemen

in the Fire Service occupy the rank of 'ordinary fireman';

they number 19,000 out of 27,000. [3] I interviewed only ordinary

and leading firemen. I did not interview the higher ranks as

a 'systems' theorist might have considered necessary.

The work of Goldthorpe et al., is an example of a

similar kind of approach. They focus on the behaviour of groups

in several different Work ~~family~~ situations. They are not concerned

with the organizations as a whole but with key groups of workers

in them. Their analysis is not without its problems, however,

and has been extensively criticised. The authors write:

"Our major aim has been to indicate a certain homogeneity

in our sample ...." "In terms of their orientation to work and

associated attitudes and behaviour in the work situation.

----

(1) One station was large with 60 or so ordinary firemen and
    the other was small with 18 or so firemen.

(2) Personnel in one of these stations had often served in
    the other.

(3) Cunningham Report, op. cit., page 9.

Variations in these respects have been observed from one occupational group to another. But, we have argued, these can best be understood as variations on, or sometimes as deviations from a central tendency, that of regarding work in a predominantly instrumental way".[1]

The problem is one of defining the precise relationship of the 'deviations' to the 'central tendency'. Earlier in their book the authors point out important differences in attitudes between the different groups of workers.[2] These differences are quite large and thus the extent to which they remain mere 'deviations from a central tendency' becomes a difficult question. It could be argued, for instance, that Goldthorpe et all., have been rather bold in their conclusions.

C. Argyris had made a similar point. He argues that the way the authors present their data undermines the importance of the considerable amount of individual variation. Argyris then argues that because of these mistakes, the action approach is not the best perspective to adopt:

"Generalizations are made about processes such as the instrumental attitudes of 'Affluent Workers'. These are, in fact, developed from responses made by workers which are then aggregated. Once having been summed up they become sociological variables whereby the individual, as a causal explanation, can be ignored ... If individual level variables had been included, the finding of

---

(1) J.H. Goldthorpe, D. Lockwood, F. Bechhofer, J. Platt, 'The Affluent Worker', Vol. 1, Cambridge University Press, page 144.

(2) For instance, in Vol. 1, Table 13, page 29, they present data to the effect that 7% of craftsmen and 31% of assemblers give the level of pay as the only reason for staying in present employment. It is figures such as these which emphasize the considerable differences between the groups.

instrumental attitudes could be predicted a priori". [1]

It does not seem reasonable to reject a well established approach to explanation and research because there are certain difficulties with a particular piece of research.   It could be argued that it is almost unreasonable to expect researchers to develop a totally adequate approach from scratch.   The problem of not obscuring differences between individuals whilst at the same time presenting general conclusions is one which many sociologists confront and the problem is not alone inherent in the work of Goldthorpe et al., but is of general significance.

The importance of individual level variables is high-lighted by Argyris who rejects explanations "in terms of ideal-typical actors whom we take to be pursuing ends by choosing appropriate means on the basis of a subjective definition of the situation".   Argyris argues that such an approach does not tell us how to deal with actors who are not typical. [2]   Argyris is undoubtedly right to point out the importance of untypicality. Inter-group differences in behaviour are often large and the question can be asked in this case whether the sociologist should accept "obvious" "formal" "easily perceived" similarities of behaviour (for instance occupational similarities MAY be an example) or whether he should try to construct his own categories (e.g. ignoring occupational status and concentrating on similarities of behaviour) based on similarities of behaviour which may exist with the aim of generating firm theoretical categories which are not solely derived from easily perceived similarities.   If the sociologist was able to construct his own group he would be able to minimise differences between members to a great extent.

----

(1)   C. Argyris, op cit.,   pages 68-69.
(2)   Ibid., page 52.

The question is "How do we cut the "actor-cake"? [1]
Do we accept the formal boundaries that exist or do we rearrange
the groupings according to other criteria?   I am now going to
set out what I regard as reasonable propositions and justify the
methodology, the approach, the sample treatment and the analysis
in my own research.

First, if there is considerable variation in the relevant
behaviour of the actors concerned, the ideal typical actor will
not be a very good indicator of the range of empirical reality.
One way of overcoming this, (when the range of individual variation
is great) is to cut the slices thinly.   Under these circumstances
a greater number of comparative 'slices' and ideal typical actors
may be necessary, depending on whether the analysis focuses on a
whole cake" or just part of it.

It can be argued that the act of cutting the cake is rather
a subjective act.   It could be said that every sociologist would
do it slightly differently and that the final product, the ideal
typical actor from each slice, will be a somewhat 'arbitrary
figure'.   In reply I would argue that this bias is not a priori
confusing or undesirable provided that the sociologist makes it
known how 'thin' the slices are cut and the reasons for cutting
the cake in any particular way.   What are the reasons for
selecting this or that group?   Is the level of inter-group
variations high?   If it is high is it necessary to recut the slices?

_____

(1)   The culinary analogy I have adopted here should not be
compared with functionalist analogies.   The "actor-cake"
in this instance represents variability of behaviour between
actors and has no relation to the functionalist notion of
a social system.   It is not therefore a "whole" integrated
cake.   The "slices" merely represent the boundaries between
categories which are deemed relevant by the sociologist
for purposes of comparison.

If not, why not? The range of variation# within the group and the reasons for operating with that type of group must be made clear.

In the pre-research pilot study of firemen's activities I cut the slices thick, and the groups were small, and the range of intra-group variation was high. This made the generation of reliable categories particularly difficult. The pilot study focused on the firemen's leisure activities and was carried out in the naive belief that occupation alone would impose a sufficient level of uniformity and minimising influence on activities outside work. It was found that individual differences with regard to particular activities (e.g. listening to the radio, walking, watching television) were so great as to make an average figure for the whole sample virtually meaningless.

However, unlike Argyris, I regard the 'ideal typical' actor concept as a useful one. The type of criticisms Argyris makes of Goldthorpe et al., and by implication of the action approach in general are not justified. The minimising approach is valid even if, practically speaking, it is not possible to minimise all significant differences to a sufficient degree in any one sample. Ideally, the sociologist would have an infinite number of actors at his disposal and from these he would be able to select 'ideal slices' for purposes of comparison. The action approach is a legitimate one and can be justified on the basis of the arguments I have presented. In practice, however, the researcher is not always able to meet ideal circumstances for the selection of groups and he may not be able to minimise differences to a satisfactory degree.

Sample Problems.

The interviews were carried out in two stations which together constituted the County Borough Brigade. In the larger station I interviewed 28 ordinary firemen and 4 leading firemen. In

the smaller station I interviewed 9 ordinary and 1 leading fireman.
The total sample size was 42. All the firemen included in the
sample were married.[1] The unmarrieds did not form a large enough
comparative sample to be included. During the interviews the firemen
often 'turned out' to emergencies and the interview was continued
when they came back. Many of the interviews were cut short in this
way. Only in 1 or 2 cases did this mean that interviews remained
unfinished. It was only when I could not find the fireman on
subsequent visits, or if he did not wish to continue the interview
that this remained the case. Omissions account for a very slight
fluctuation in the size of the sample. All the interviews took
place in the evening. This was the firemen's 'stand-down' period
during which time they were free from all but operational duties.
The length of the interviews was somewhat variable, the average
being $1\frac{1}{2}$ hours.

The questionnaire was standardised - the same questions were
asked of all firemen. However, it was apparent to me that the inter-
views themselves were in no way standardised interactions - every
one was different. The variability of interactions based on a
standardised questionnaire is one of the problems that I faced. The
point has been made by Cicourel[2] that it is easy for the observer
to assume that his subjects employ the same basic meaning structures
as his own and it is assumed that there is a world taken for granted
by both subject and experimenter. Cicourel calls such an approach
to research design 'measurement by fiat' because it imposes the
observer's definitions on to a situation. He says it assumes a
common culture in the standardised questions which it offers to
respondents and in the assignment of importance to the answers.[3]

----

(1) Unmarried men were also interviewed but were not included
    in the sample.

(2) A. Cicourel, op cit., page 167.

(3) Cicourel, op cit., page 227.

Cicourel is right. My questionnaire was based on the experience I gained in county and town stations and I found out that many of the assumptions I built into the questionnaire did not apply to the city station. Before I commenced the main body of interviews to be included in the sample I 'tested' the schedule in 10 interviews. Questions which were inapplicable were at this stage eliminated. A few other questions which I considered perfectly legitimate from a sociological point of view seemed irrelevant or on occasions received a 'doubtful' response from the firemen. It was as if they did not know how to answer it, or if it was important enough to answer in detail. My interpretation of the reasons for these responses is given in the empirical section of the research.

In order to secure permission to interview the firemen I wrote to the Chief Fire Officer of the Brigade. He gave me permission to visit the station and ask the firemen for an interview. No fireman was 'ordered' to attend the interview, and some of the firemen were more willing than others to be interviewed. Each interview was carried out as the result of a request on my part to each fireman. The situation was such that the pre-interview interaction was variable in each case. The first interviews began fairly formally. After I had introduced myself the officers summoned some pre-determined volunteers. At this stage I was testing the questionnaire and the first ten men were not included in the sample. After this 'formal' stage the pre-interview interaction became less formalised. A 'joking' situation was set up whereby firemen who had been interviewed helped me cajole/ persuade firemen who at first seemed diffident about the prospect of an interview. The length of the interviews depended on the fireman's attitude and this was very often established in the

pre-interview interaction.   In many cases an informal discussion
was held after the main body of questions.   This again was variable.
Many firemen did not want to stick to the interview routine and in
these instances there was an amount of informal chat between
questions.   The situation then was not always interviewer-fireman;
very often the fireman would determine the areas to be talked about.
In other cases nothing much happened apart from my asking the
questions and getting the answers.

A short interview did not necessarily mean that the
respondent was hostile to the situation.   Some firemen said a lot in
a short space of time.   It was just that they wanted to continue
playing badminton/darts/cards with their mates.   Other interviews
were both formal and short - there being nothing much happening
apart from my asking and getting answers to the questions.

The interviews were all taped, and the information from
the tapes transferred to schedules after it was finished.   The
presence of a tape recorder did not seem to offend the respondents
(though there were a few jokes about Watergate) and it seemed to
encourage the respondents to relate their experiences in more detail
than was the case in the pilot interviews.   However, I cannot be
absolutely sure that the better interactional flow at the later
interviews was not a consequence of my having 'learned' much more
about fire stations and my being in a better position to relate
to the firemen about the work in more meaningful terms.   In the
pilot interviews at the town and county stations, I had noticed
that what the respondents had said, and in particular how much
they said, was too highly correlated with how quickly I seemed to
be writing it all down, and understanding it.   The tape recorder
had a standardising effect - it meant I could keep going longer
without becoming tired or losing concentration.   In one instance,
I had been talking to a fireman for $1\frac{1}{2}$ hours when the following

interaction occurred - I had so far asked him 8 questions:

".... if it was not for the lads being like they are now - they do make the job a bit better - without them, I'd be out of a job.   I've got to run now because its nearly 1 a.m.   You made me thirsty with all that talking.   You haven't asked me any questions yet either (laugh)".

"Can I ask you a few questions?"

"Go on them, ask me a few questions."

"What effect does having to suddenly get up and go to a fire have on the other activities you are doing?"

"Which activities do you mean?"

"Well, like watching television - you'd rather watch TV, that's what you said."

"What effect does it have on them?   On the activities?"

"Yes.   You like watching TV, right, rather than going out to fires.   Presumably when you are watching a good TV programme and you have to turn out does it make you think 'I won't watch TV tonight'."

"No.   If there's something good on TV I'll watch it."

It was very likely that the pre-interview interaction with this fireman had confirmed his expectations that I would not act in an entirely formal manner.   When I first met him he wanted to know whether I was someone from a university, saw myself as an expert in science, and he asked me various questions.   The above question that I asked this fireman was an example of a question which I thought would likely yield some directly interesting results.   The hypothesis that directly interesting results would emerge from it was disproved.   Most firemen, like the one above, did not immediately understand why I should ask such a question.   It did not seem an obvious one to ask.   Nevertheless, it could prove an extremely difficult task to devise a questionnaire that was exactly

in line with respondents' every definition and expectation.

I believe the questionnaire and interview method to be a useful one in so far as it minimises differences as much as is possible, if used skillfully. Each question forms a base for an interaction sequence which finishes when an adequate answer has been given.[1] If certain questions do not fit into respondents' subjective definitions the facts are noted and an effort made to find out why.

The process of minimising the differences between groups can only proceed up to a certain point - differences will not vanish if one uses certain techniques. It is impossible to completely abolish differences in a varied group of people. To carry the 'minimisation' as far as possible, however, three techniques were used. First, the use of a questionnaire for each respondent; secondly, confining the analysis to firemen working in the same area from the same stations; thirdly, interviewing firemen of similar rank.

The key feature of the fireman's role is the emergency to which he 'turns out'. He has a special relationship with the crisis and the nature of this relationship is the subject of later chapters. The usefulness of 'crisis' as an explanatory variable for comparative organisational analysis is considered with particular reference to Blauner's Bay Chemical Process workers.[2] Like firemen, their work cycle is characterised by the alternation of routine and crisis - but the men have a very different relationship with the crisis situation itself.

= = = = = = = = = = = =

_ _

(1) Who decides the adequacy of the responses? I argue that the sociologist is in a good position to assess whether an answer is meaningful or not. If the respondent cannot answer the question, or finds it "unusual", or irrelevant the sociologist should find out why the respondent defines the situation in this way.

(2) R. Blauner, 'Alienation and Freedom', University of Chicago Press, 1964.

III. EXISTING APPROACHES TO WORK INVOLVEMENT.

B. Glazer and A. Strauss argue that it is better for
sociologists to generate new theory than it is for them to verify
earlier theoretical work.[1]   In practice, however, the dividing
line between what is new and what is old, between generation and
verification, is thin.   One can generate new theory while using
platforms developed by earlier sociologists.   One is verifying
and generating at the same time.   This is because old theory has
quite a broad base which makes it relevant to new theoretical work.
'Old' theory might be only partially applicable but it is not
usually completely irrelevant and inadequate.

My critique of what has 'gone before' is made with the
proviso that it is not meant to be a total critique of all
pre-existing work.   If industrial sociology is to develop, the
defects and specific focuses of earlier approaches must be
discussed.   Much confusion has resulted from the fact that
different projects, supposedly dealing with similar areas, have
quite different focuses.   What is the strong point of one is often
the weak point of another.

The 'Affluent Worker' series is a research project of
major significance.   Workers were interviewed from three firms;
assemblers at Vauxhall;   machinists, machine setters and
maintenance personnel at Skefco;   and process workers and process
maintenance personnel at Laporte.[2]

Goldthorpe found that his sample of assemblers had given
up work with higher levels of intrinsic interest, greater

- -

(1) B. Glaser and A. Strauss, op cit., page 2-15.

(2) J. Goldthorpe et al., 'The Affluent Worker', Vol. 3,
     Cambridge University Press, 1971.

responsibility and with more opportunities to use skills and abilities.[1] The reason they acted in this way was that they attached priority to a high level of remuneration in their work and they were prepared to forego intrinsic rewards for a higher economic return from work. They defined their place of work as primarily a source of income and were prepared to forego all other types of rewards in order to maximise earnings. The assemblers put up with the deprivations of working on an assembly line and they rated their employer and their jobs highly because it enabled them to obtain a higher income than would a job with a higher level of intrinsic satisfaction. They sacrificed intrinsic rewards for economic return, and they wanted to make this sacrifice in the situation they found themselves in. They defined work as a means to an end. They had an 'instrumental orientation' to work. Because they did not regard the job as a source of intrinsic satisfaction they did not want to be praised by the supervisor and were happy as long as they were left alone.

W.W. Daniel has summarised the 'assumptions' on which the instrumented orientation to work concept is based.[2] First, he argues the concept assumes that workers have a consistent set of priorities in the types of rewards they seek from work. Second, these priorities are revealed by the critical occupational decisions they make, which involve the evaluation of the relative merits and demerits, for them, of different jobs. Thirdly, the patterns of priorities revealed by these choices and decisions represent their orientation to work. This orientation to work

_____

(1)   J.H. Goldthorpe, 'Attitudes and Behaviour of Car Assembly
       Workers: a Deviant Case and a Theoretical Critique',
       British Journal of Sociology, Sept. 1966.

(2)   W.W. Daniel, 'Productivity Bargaining & Orientation to Work
       - A Rejoinder to Goldthorpe', Journal of Management Studies,
       Vol. 8, No.3, October 1971, pages 329 - 330.

will mediate the evaluation of all occupational events and
situations.

'Technology' versus Orientation to Work.

Goldthorpe and Lockwood do not attach the greatest
importance to technology as a factor determining attitudes to work
and the structure of work relationships.   They maintain that the
sociologist should know the way the workers order their wants and
expectations relative to their employment and the meaning that work
has for the worker before tackling the question of job satisfaction
as such.[1] Their emphasis is on the importance of prior
orientations to work, of a largely instrumental nature, which
enable the 'Affluent Workers' to see relationship with their firm
in a generally positive way despite the 'objective alternating'
conditions in which they work.

By contrast J. Woodward has argued that technology is
one variable which it is possible to isolate and which proves to
be a significant determinant of industrial behaviour.   She argues
that her research in South Essex demonstrates the closeness of the
link between technology and industrial behaviour at both manage-
ment and operator levels.[2] The firms were grouped according to
similarity of objectives and techniques of production, and classified
in order of the technical complexity of their production systems.
Woodward argues that each production system was associated with a
characteristic pattern of organization and that technical methods
were the most important factor in determining organizational
structure and in setting the tone of human relationships in the firm.[3]

(1)   Op cit., Vol. 1, page 36.
(2)   J. Woodward, 'Industrial Behaviour - Is there a Science?',
      New Society, 8 October 1964, page 12.
(3)   J. Woodward, 'Management and Technology', London, H.M.S.O.
      1958, page 4.

R. Blauner argues that the more advanced forms of production technology are more conducive to the creation of normatively integrated industrial enterprises than are technologies of intermediate age.[1]

Whereas Blauner focuses on the degree of alienation in work as the crucial variable, Goldthorpe and Lockwood pay most attention to the workers' attachment to their jobs. They argue that the effects of technologically determined conditions of work are always mediated through the meanings that men give their work. They find no relationship between work which might be considered 'objectively alienating' and attachment to the job.[2]

Goldthorpe does not deny that technology has some importance. He argues that technology is often a condition of action in industrial plants but that it is not the source of values and motivations from which social action in the work situation actually stems.[3]

With regard to the 'Affluent Worker' survey Daniel argues that the satisfactory relations which the authors found in the plant could be explained by the technologically determined job structure:

"Any conceivable task-related contact between supervisors and men in assembly line technology is likely to be coercive, punitive or constructive. It is not surprising that the men wish to be left alone in such circumstances. The only alternative to

_____

(1) The technologies which Blauner associates with alienation were automobile technology and textile technology. This type of organization is considerably newer than that associated with craft organization and produces a higher level of alienation. However Blauner argues that the latest automated continuous process technologies do not produce a high level of alienation.

(2) Op cit., Vol. 3, page 181.

(3) J. Goldthorpe, 'The Social Actions Approach to Industrial Sociology - A Reply to Daniel', Journal of Management Studies, Vol. 7, No.2, 1970, page 205.

being left alone is to be pushed harder, to be disciplined, or

have their method of working even more closely defined; in short,

to have their tiny area of discretion ever further restricted.

The desire to be left alone could reflect a desire for some

autonomy in the work situation rather than an instrumental

orientation." (1)

In reply Goldthorpe argues that Daniel is loth to accept

the idea of varying orientations to work which are capable of

producing different responses to the same objective condition.(2)

'Psychological Theory' versus Orientation to Work.

The approach of the 'psychological' school is best

illustrated by a brief resume of the words of Argyris, McGregor

and Herzberg.

McGregor's(3) theory is based on Maslow's(4) idea of a

human need hierarchy.   According to this theory man is a wanting

animal with an ascending order of needs.   At the lowest level are

psychological needs, particularly those of food, water, clothing

and shelter.   Ascending the scale, safety needs (economic security)

and social needs (acceptance by one's peers) are followed by those

for self-esteem, status, self-fulfillment and self-actualization.

Maslow suggests that only when a lower level need has been satisfied

will a higher need become operative.

_ _

(1)   W.W. Daniel, 'Industrial Behaviour and Orientation to
      Work: A Critique', Journal of Management Studies,
      Vol. 6, No.3, Oct. 1969.

(2)   J. Goldthorpe, 'The Social Action Approach to Industrial
      Sociology: A Reply to Daniel', op cit., page 205.

(3)   D. McGregor, 'The Human Side to Enterprise',
      New York, McGraw-Hill, 1960.

(4)   A.H. Maslow, 'Motivation and Personality',
      New York, Harper and Row, 1954.

Herzberg's [1] starting point is that motivation is generated by the opportunity to satisfy needs in work and that if you want to know what the worker's needs are, then look at the type of satisfaction he gets from work.   He asked workers the occasions on which they felt good in work.   From the answers he deduced the most important factors:-

1.   The completion of tasks representing a personal achievement for the workers.

2.   When the workers were praised, rewarded, or complimented.

3.   When the workers met new challenges or were promoted.

C. Argyris makes similar claims about workers' needs and much of his work is based on the idea that there is a basic incongruence between the 'needs of the mature personality' and the requirements of formal organization.   Whereas children are 'passive', adults develop needs for independence.   Adults seek to "Minimize dependance to gain control over their immediate world, to develop many abilities". [2]   He suggests that a high emphasis on "money and other material rewards" is an individual adaptation to a work situation which creates psychological conflict and frustration. [3]

Daniel has argued that these theorists are exponents of the psychological universalistic approach.   "They are psychological in that they analyse occupational behaviour in terms of needs, satisfactions and motivations.   They are universalistic in the

_ _

(1)   F. Herzberg, B.Mausner, B. Snyderman, 'The Motivation to Work', New York, Wiley, 1959   and
F. Herzberg, 'Work and the Nature of Man', London, Staples, 1968.

(2)   C. Argyris, op cit., page 54.

(3)   Ibid.,

sense that they suggest that there are needs shared by workers of all types and levels and their response to the work situation can be explained in terms of the extent to which these needs are satisfied.[1]

In the chapter on Methodology I have shown that Argyris criticizes Goldthorpe et al. for not taking enough account of individual variation. Argyris, however, is guilty of the same error; he postulates a theory of universal adult needs which itself admits of little individual variation. Ingham has argued that this type of psychological approach is not totally inapplicable to the analysis of industrial behaviour but that because these theories do not allow for variations in culturally based orientations to work they are often inadequate as a result.[2]

Silverman has argued that the difficulty with assuming certain internal personality needs among the members of an organization is that there is often very little opportunity to validate the existence of such needs.[3] Argyris asks the question: "What would happen if people who aspire for psychological success populated organizations?" He then argues that because everyone does not achieve this success, their needs must therefore be suppressed by management and organization. He calls on management to allow the workers opportunities for 'self-actualization' in work. Silverman points out that this 'self might be difficult to achieve in practice. Worker participation

---

(1) W.W. Daniel, 'Understanding Employee Behaviour in its
     Context: Illustrations from Productivity Bargaining', op.cit.

(2) G. Ingham, 'Size of Industrial Organizations and Worker
     Behaviour', Cambridge Papers in Sociology, Cambridge
     University Press, page 48.

(3) D. Silverman, op cit., page 85.

could be said to be impracticable because it involves an attack

upon what management generally regards as its prerogative.

The Validity and Applicability of the Concept
'Orientation to Work'.

Any application of the concept 'orientation to work' is

faced with a number of problems.   The concept as developed in the

'Affluent Worker' series was an unusual context in so far as a

situation of full employment prevailed and a wide choice of jobs

was available.   The problem then is how to apply a concept

generated in circumstances such as these to work situations of a

different type.   Some writers have questioned the validity of the

concept itself.

W.W. Daniel believes that there is a lack of evidence to

support the significance of orientation to work as a concept

explaining in-plant relationships and behaviour.   It is "the idea

that there is within each works or groups of workers one single

generalized set of priorities against which all occupational

experience is measured, that I want to challenge". [1]

He argues that there is "confusion about the term job

satisfaction and, in particular confusion between satisfaction

with a job and satisfaction in a job". [2]   For Daniel satisfaction

with the sources of attachment to the job is a very different

thing from the relative opportunities that different jobs provide

for positive satisfaction from work through intrinsic interest.

It can be argued that attachment merely represents the best

bargain in terms of these opportunities - as the workers see

them.   It has nothing to do with job satisfaction as such.

_____

(1) W.W. Daniel, 'Understanding Employee Behaviour in its Context:
    Illustrations from Productivity Bargaining, op. cit., page 44.

(2) W.W. Daniel, 'Industrial Behaviour and Orientation to Work -
    A Critique', op. cit., pages 372-3.

Daniel[1] took the example of a recent productivity
agreement in petro-chemical plants to illustrate his case against
the generalised orientation to work explanation.   The agreement
gave increased earnings which ranged from 15 - 30 per cent, and
conditions of employment more akin to those of staff employees,
including a guaranteed annual salary, full pay when sick and an
end to 'clocking in'.   In return the workers accepted a reduction
in manning.   The agreement was at first fiercely resisted but
after nine months it was completely approved.   Daniel writes:
"These findings show once negotiations were completed, the formal
benefits furnished by the agreement became less salient and what
became important were the day to day changes it generated in their
day to day activities and relationships at work".   He argues that
it was a complete reversal of attitudes.   At the beginning, money
was aalient, but at the later stage intrinsic conditions were
salient.

Daniel argues that it is not legitimate to project
priorities and factors derived from one situation (the decision to
take a particular job) on to a quite different situation (behaviour
in the work place itself).   He argues that the factors which
attract workers to the job (security, level of earnings, physical
working conditions) are different from those found rewarding in the
job (the opportunity to use their abilities in learning and problem
solving and the intrinsic interest in work itself) and these in
turn are different from those, if any, that predispose workers to
leave (the lack of opportunity for advancement).   He illustrates
the way that workers themselves differentiate between what attracts

_____

(1)   W.W. Daniel, 'Industrial Behaviour and Orientation to Work',
       op. cit., page 370   and
       'Productivity Bargaining and Orientation to Work! A Rejoinder
       to Goldthorpe', op cit.,

them to a job and the way that they behave in it. He suggests
that the change is from instrumental to intrinsic orientation.

However, Goldthorpe argues that "If workers who are
regarded as having a markedly instrumental orientation to work
contest a proposed productivity deal on essentially 'money for
effort' grounds but then, after the deal is implemented, are
gratified to discover that their jobs have become less tiring and
more directly rewarding, it does not follow that it was mistaken
to regard them as instrumentally oriented in the first place or
that they subsequently ceased to be so".[1]   Goldthorpe argues
that the petro-chemical workers did not really change their
orientation at all, and that it is natural for workers with a
primarily instrumental orientation to strive for any 'intrinsic'
benefits that are to be had.

Goldthorpe argues that for the change of orientation to
have taken place, from instrumental to intrinsic,"it would have
to be shown that the workers had significantly changed the order
of their priorities in work so that, say, they pressed for
further job enlargement, variety, etc. even if at the cost of
their foregoing some wage increase".[2]

Daniel does not agree with this opinion.   He argues
that increasing demands along one dimension, such as the
demand for increased intrinsic rewards, does not mean that demands
for increased extrinsic rewards will become less.

----

(1)   J.H. Goldthorpe, 'Daniel on Orientation to Work' in Journal
      of Management Studies, 1972, page 269.

(2)   J. Goldthorpe, 'Daniel on Orientation to Work',
      op. cit., page 269.

(3)   W.W. Daniel, 'Understanding Employee Behaviour in its
      Context: Illustrations from Productivity Bargaining',
      op cit.,

Whereas Goldthorpe et al look at the job STATICALLY Daniel looks at it DYNAMICALLY. Whereas Goldthorpe focuses on the basic differences of balance between intrinsic/extrinsic rewards in different jobs Daniel looks at the changing orientations in one job itself. This difference of approach has resulted in a difference of emphasis. Because Goldthorpe et al focus on choices between jobs they do not pay attention to the ongoing changes within one job itself. Daniel has an almost 'Parsonian' view of job satisfaction. He relates the possibilities of expanding both intrinsic and economic rewards within one job and the 'choice' relationship for these workers is not as clear cut or as 'single stranded' as it was for the 'Affluent Workers'. The unexpected incidents at chemical plants gave the workers quite a lot by way of intrinsic interest.[1] Jobs like this (those which offer intrinsic satisfaction) are also the ones which are likely to socialise the workers to 'need' interesting work. Work itself produces a particular kind of orientation to work. Brown has made the point that most workers' orientations to work are not as clear cut as those of the 'Affluent Workers'.[2] Choices that many workers have to make are more complex because they are concerned with attaining a suitable balance of intrinsic and extrinsic satisfactions whilst making sure that the job is compatible with their non work roles. Brown has argued that for those who want a number of things out of their employment it may not be entirely clear, even to the actors themselves, to which they attach greatest importance.

---

(1) This finding is constant with my own research on the unpredictability of emergencies in the Fire Service.

(2) R. Brown, 'Sources of Objectives in Work and Employment', in J. Child (ed.) 'Man and Organization', London, Allen and Unwin, page 28.

Brown asks the question of how far the worker's expression
of his objectives in work merely reflect the meanings culturally
available to him and considered appropriate as questionnaire
replies.   He cites the example of the married women who said
that "of course they worked for money" (because it was considered
a legitimate reason for working).   But it became apparent that
they worked for a variety of other reasons some of which were less
culturally acceptable.

The point about an 'instrumental orientation' is that it
is single stranded.   This is in contrast to the complexity of
the other orientations to work.   Goldthorpe and Lockwood argue
that all work activity in industrial society tends to have a basic
instrumental component and that the other three types of
orientation are deviations from this type.[1]

This is an important point because whereas a pure
'instrumental' orientation will stress financial rewards only,
the 'ideal type' expressive orientation will include an instrumental
component.   The problem is, what percentage of 'instrumentalism'
is consistent with an 'expressive' orientation to work?

It is clear that Goldthorpe et al's concept of 'orientation
to work' involves the notion of sacrifice.   Moreover this
sacrifice could be measured by virtue of the 'single stranded'
nature of the workers orientation, which made it possible to see
that something had been 'given up'.

The notion of sacrifice, however, is not so easily
applicable to 'expressive type' orientations (which by Goldthorpe
et al's own argument are deviations from the instrumental one)

----

(1)   The question may be asked why the authors did not make the
       more complex 'expressive' orientation (with its instrumental
       component included) the core concept with the instrumental
       orientation a deviant case which was a response to specific
       constraints that the workers faced.

which retain their instrumental component or at least part of it.
Money is never sacrificed altogether.   For Goldthorpe et al. the
demonstration of an intrinsic reward involves evidence of the
sacrifice of economic rewards.[1]

It is apparent that the ease with which 'sacrifice' can be
verified also depends on the place of the occupation being analysed
in the class structure.   Middle-class occupations, for instance,
afford their occupants high economic and high non-economic rewards
from work.   Where is the sacrifice?   How do we assess the
middle class orientation to work?   Presumably at this level the
whole analysis would have to become more subtle and instead of
relying on absolute sacrifice the methods used would have to be
capable of ascertaining the relative sacrifice or 'trade off' which
may have taken place in one direction or another.   This would be
a more complex enterprise than ascertaining the more obvious
TOTAL sacrifice of intrinsic rewards which the 'Affluent Workers'
made.

It is true to say that the concept of orientation to work
used by Goldthorpe et al., is a highly specific one in that it
requires a situation of constraint in which the worker has to choose
between alternatives because he cannot achieve both instrumental
and intrinsic satisfactions.   The worker therefore has to occupy
a particular place in the class structure to fulfill this criterion.
Also the worker (once in this situation of being able to achieve
one but not both of these objectives) must have a completely free
choice as to which target he prefers.   There must be a freedom to
choose between intrinsic and extrinsic rewards.   The authors,

_ _

(1)   J.H. Goldthorpe, 'Daniel on Orientation to Work',
       op. cit., page 269.

however, argue that their research was conducted under conditions of full or near full employment.

Goldthorpe et al., give evidence of the previous work experience of the sample and they classify the highest occupational level attained.[1] They argue that many were working in more highly skilled jobs before taking up their present employment. They claim that the workers liked their previous intrinsically satisfying jobs but do not say why they gave them up. The authors do not analyse the 'history' of each respondent with a view to understanding the decisions they had to make, e.g. it is not clear exactly what percentage of the sample were married when they took up their employment.

TABLE 3. 1

PREVIOUS WORK EXPERIENCE: CLASSIFICATION OF HIGHEST OCCUPATIONAL LEVEL ATTAINED*

	Percentage	
	ASSEMBLERS	ALL
PROFESSIONAL, MANAGERIAL, WHITE COLLAR	7	7
SELF EMPLOYED	7	9
SUPERVISORY, INSPECTIONAL, MINOR OFFICIAL AND SERVICES	28	18
SKILLED MANUAL (APPRENTICESHIP OR EQUIVALENT)	16	26
SKILLED MANUAL (OTHER)	23	18
SEMI-SKILLED MANUAL) UNSKILLED MANUAL)	19	21
TOTALS	100	99

(1) Jobs lasting less than one year were not counted.

* Op. cit., Vol. 1, page 32.

Orientation to Work and Socialization Experience.

Beynon and Blackburn argue that the way in which work is experienced depends neither on work nor non-work orientations alone but on the interaction of the two.   In addition an orientation should not be thought of as arising outside and brought into the work situation but as something that derives from the individual's total experience.   This total experience includes the worker's experience of work and the labour market which imposes an awareness of the limited possibilities open to him.   Beynon and Blackburn consider that such an interaction approach rejects the dichotomy between work and non-work life.   They write:

"In the Luton study, for instance, it seems that orientations are attributed with a permanence` that remains unaffected by the experience of work.   Whatever the particular features of the Luton study it would be unwise to introduce a priori into other studies similar assumptions about the relationship of orientation to work experience."[1]

R. Brown has made a related point.[2]   He states that the crucial point about a 'single stranded' instrumental orientation is that it is clear, and there are no problems of priorities, or of incompatible objectives.   However, for workers who have more complex orientations to work, who seek not only economic rewards but also intrinsic rewards, the question of priorities is bound to arive.   In assessing a possible job or expressing one's satisfaction or dissatisfaction in an existing job, a variety of incommensurable factors have to be combined and evaluated in making

_____

(1)   H. Beynon and R.M. Blackburn, 'Perceptions at Work: Variations within a Factory', Cambridge Papers in Sociology 3, Cambridge University Press.

(2)   R. Brown, 'Sources of Objectives in Work and Employment', op. cit., page 28.

a choice or response.   Brown argues that except in certain contexts asking about an actor's orientation to work implies that he makes a fairly continuous and conscious evaluation of priorities.   Does any such evaluation necessarily result in a coherent and rational set of objectives?

D. Silverman considers that by arguing that work orientations are shaped by a combination of internal and external factors it is possible to omit to consider the way in which people's view of themselves and of their situation is the outcome of an ongoing process, i.e. there is no determination by one set of constraints but there is always experience of 'becoming' as successive experiences shape and reshape a subjective definition of self and society.[1]

Perhaps this is the point that Daniel has in mind when he argues that it is not legitimate for the concept of 'orientation to work' to be extended to cover all aspects of the work situation; to explain sources of gratification and deprivation in work, responses to different styles of supervision, relationships with other members of work groups, determinants of performance and evaluations of the employer.   Daniel argues that the concept is only relevant with regard to job choice.   For Daniel all that can be predicted from job choice decisions and priorities is job choice behaviour.[2]

Brown argues that there is little clear evidence of the relative importance of prior orientation to work and socialization at work in determining subsequent attitudes and expectations.[3]

----

(1)   D. Silverman, op. cit., page 71.

(2)   W.W. Daniel, 'Industrial Behaviour and Orientation to Work', op. cit., page 367, and 'Understanding Employee Behaviour in its Context: Illustrations from Productivity Bargaining', op. cit., page 52.

(3)   R. Brown, op. cit., page 32.

He cites the work of Nichols who considers the values and frames of reference of propertied and non-propertied directors. Nichols suggests that the "process of socialization undergone within the corporation is an equally, if not more, important factor in the development of the director's value orientation than pre-corporate socialization".[1]

In addition, the orientations of computer programmers were studied by Sheldrake. These orientations were seen as resulting partly from differences in careers and work experiences, though in part also from prior differences in education and qualifications.[2]

Brown's study of shipbuilding apprentices lends empirical support to the importance of socialization as an influence on orientations to work.[3]

Ingham has argued that expectations with regard to non-economic rewards are likely to develop gradually and to vary with the nature of the industrial experience of the worker.[4]

The main theme of the next chapter in this study is the precise way in which previous work experience interacts with actors' ongoing definitions of themselves and of their situation to form an orientation to work which is by no means single stranded. The firemen were considerably influenced by their 'services life' but this job was incompatible with their changing family responsibilities. They reconciled this contradiction by choosing an occupation which provided the satisfactions of the military way of life but which did not possess its total character.   The total character of army life was enjoyable when the firemen were

---

(1)   T. Nichols, 'Ownership, Control and Ideology', London, Allen and Unwin, 1969, page 119.

(2)   P.F. Sheldrake, 'Orientations to Work among Computer Programmers', in Sociology, No.5, pages 209-27.

(3)   R. Brown, op cit., page 32-34.

(4)   G. Ingham, op. cit., page 137

single but they were now married and it did not fit in very well with family life.   These arguments are discussed in detail in the next chapter.

The Empirical Validity of the 'Affluent Worker' Series.

J. Westergaard argues that if the 'Affluent Workers' commitment to the job and their commitment to co-operation with foremen and management depends on the fulfillment of monetary conditions, the commitment is clearly a brittle one.[1]

R. Blackburn argues in a similar vein to Westergaard.[2] He disputes Goldthorpe et al.'s contention that the 'Affluent workers' did not see their relationship with management in 'oppositional' terms.   He argues that the strike at Vauxhall, one month after Goldthorpe et al., had published their findings, highlighted three factors which the authors failed to consider:

(a) Profits per worker at Vauxhall were high.
Vauxhall made £900 profit each year for every
man employed.

(b) The management were under pressure to keep up
this level of profit.   Therefore the works
was put on a four day week.   The workers
felt that such a profitable company could
afford to maintain its workers' wage packets.

(c) Even though workers may be prepared to repress
their desire for pleasant and creative work
this does not mean that the desire for intrinsic
satisfactions in work have been lost for ever.

Blackburn therefore takes up Westergaard's argument that

----

(1)   J. Westergaard, 'The Rediscovery of the Cash Nexus', in the
Socialist Register, London, The Merlin Press, page 120.

(2)   R. Blackburn, 'The Unequal Society', in Blackburn and
Cockburn (eds.) 'The Incompatibles': Trade Union Militancy
and the Consensus', London 1967.

the 'cash nexus' may snap just because it is only a cash nexus.
Blackburn is supplying the empirical validation of Westergaard's
argument that the single stranded character of the 'cash
orientation' implies a latent instability of workers' commitments.

Goldthorpe et al., replied to this criticism.   They
argue that the strike was short lived and that the dissatisfaction,
rather than being generalised, was highly focused on the matter
of remuneration.[1]

"We would query whether the dissatisfaction which
assemblers typically experience in performing their work tasks
necessarily means generalised dissatisfaction - with supervision,
with management, with their firm as an employer - and whether,
therefore, assembly-line technology itself automatically
generates work relationships which are characterized by persuasive
and highly charged antagonisms." [2]

= = = = = = = = = = = =

---

(1)   Op. cit., Vol. 1, page 195.

(2)   J. Goldthorpe, 'The Social Action Approach to Industrial
       Sociology', op. cit., page 205.

IV. THE FIREMAN AS AN OCCUPATIONAL ROLE.

The difficulties of applying the concept 'orientation
to work' have been analysed. This section is concerned with
the recruitment, socialization of the firemen; the work tasks
which make up the role; the attitudes of the firemen to these
tasks and orientation to work of the firemen in my sample.
Some attempt is made to probe and discuss the theoretical and
empirical regularities which the research uncovered.

Recruitment and Socialization Experience.

The Cunningham Inquiry has shown that newly recruited
firemen, before they joined the Fire Service, had worked in one
of the following job areas:-   the building and construction
industry, engineering, the Services, central government, and
local government. According to the Report, newly recruited
firemen form part of the same labour pool as drivers, semi-skilled
workers in the construction and engineering industries, services
personnel and some lower level clerical workers. There was little
movement to and from manufacturing industry.[1] These findings
were also true of my sample.

The Table 4.1 on the following page shows the high
percentage of ex-servicemen in the Fire Service. In my sample
17 of the 42 married firemen had been in one of the services.[2]
This represents 40% of the sample and is slightly higher than
the Thomas figures.

_ _

(1)   Op. cit., page 56.

(2)   Two firemen described themselves as 'seamen' or as
      'having been away at sea'.

TABLE 4. 1

INDUSTRY OF JOBS PRIOR TO JOINING THE FIRE SERVICE**

	Junior Ranks	Senior Ranks	General Population*
	%	%	%
Public Administration and Defence (includes military service).	23	27	6
Distributive Trades	14	15	12
Construction	12	7	7
Transport and Communication	9 }41	10 }38	7 }36
Engineering & Electrical Goods	6	6	10
Other	36	35	58
Total	100	100	100
% Base (up to four most recent jobs for junior and senior ranks)	4,036	1,365	22,828 thousand

* Source: Estimated number of employees in Great Britain, mid-1967 'Ministry of Labour Gazette, March 1968'.

** M. Thomas op. cit., page 16.

The M. Thomas Survey was an enquiry undertaken for the
Home Office.   The sample was drawn from 35 brigades in Great
Britain.   In this report it is stated that:

" Of those who have done military service 47% of the senior
ranks and 30% of the junior ranks said they were attracted to
the Fire Service because of its similarity to life in the
forces.   It is interesting that some men who have not done
military service were also attracted for this reason (4% of
the junior ranks and 6% of the senior ranks who had not done
military service)." (1)

Table 4. 2 is adapted from evidence given in the
M. Thomas Survey.   The firemen in this sample were asked the
question: "What was it about the Fire Service that made you
decide to join it?" (2)   The results indicate that these
firemen had a multi-stranded/orientation to work at the time
of joining up. (3)

expressive

---

(1)   Op. cit., page 21.

(2)   The defect with this type of question is that it is
       retrospective and relies on memory.

(3)   My use of the term "expressive" orientation is outlined
       in later chapters.

TABLE 4. 2

WHAT IT WAS ABOUT THE FIRE SERVICE THAT MADE RESPONDENTS DECIDE TO JOIN IT. *

	MAIN REASONS FOR JOINING FIRE SERVICE	REASONS FOR JOINING FIRE SERVICE
MORE EXPRESSIVE	%	%
GLAMOUR, EXCITEMENT, VARIETY, ACTIVITY	16	37
SIMILARITY TO LIFE IN THE FORCES	9	18
OPPORTUNITY FOR SERVICE TO THE PUBLIC	4	15
PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE DURING WAR	4	11
FAMILY CONNECTIONS WITH FIRE SERVICE	2	8
FRIENDS IN THE FIRE SERVICE	2	8
RECOMMENDED (other than by family/ friends)	1	4
OUTDOOR JOB	2	5
LIFE LONG AMBITION	2	5
UNIFORMED, DISCIPLINED SERVICE	1	4
COMRADESHIP	1	2
STATUS OF THE FIRE SERVICE	**	2
⌐INVOLVED STAYING IN ONE PLACE/ ↳ LIVING AT HOME	2	3
TOTAL EXPRESSIVE	**45**	**122**
MORE INSTRUMENTAL		
REASONS ASSOCIATED WITH SECURITY		
1. REGULAR, EMPLOYMENT, PAY	31	45
2. PENSION SCHEME	8	22
3. GOOD PAY, SICK PAY, SICK BENEFITS	9	20
4. SECURITY (unspecified)	3	4
GOOD PROMOTION PROSPECTS	5	15
HOURS	1	4
HOUSING ACCOMMODATION	2	4
NEEDED A TRADE/SKILL	1	3
EARLY RETIREMENT	1	3
TOTAL INSTRUMENTAL	**61**	**120**
OTHERS		
DON'T KNOW	1	3
OTHER	1	4
TOTAL OTHERS	**2**	**7**
GRAND TOTAL	**109******	**149*****

**   Less than 0.5 per cent.

***   Adds to more than 100 per cent as many respondents gave more than one reason.

****   Adds to more than 100 per cent because although respondents were asked to give one main reason, some still gave more than one answer.

*   Adapted from a table in M. Thomas op. cit., page 19

My own evidence for the importance of 'military socialization', as a factor influencing the respondents' orientation to work, is given below:

"I wanted a job with a uniform and similar companionship."

"I got married and tried docking, driving, plastering and building. This is the first job I settled into."

"The army changed me. I could not settle into my previous job as a textile engineer. The routine of sitting in an office with a particular machine .... I could not get back into it. My brother suggested that the Fire Service was similar to life in the army and I decided to give it a try."

"I was in the building before the army. I could not settle in building again. I wanted a uniformed job."

Janowitz writes that: "The military profession is more than an occupation: it is a complete style of life. The officer is a member of a community whose claims over his daily existence extend well beyond his official duties." [1]

Durkheim points out that military service creates a kind of mechanical solidarity which is akin to the type of social integration in primitive societies. The army life is organized so as to partially replace the need for a family. Soldiers are 'altruistic' in their orientation to one another.

S. Dornbusch has claimed that the 'swab' recruit in the American Military Academy is stripped of his connection with the outside world so that a unified group of swabs is produced rather than a heterogenous collection of persons of high and low status. [3]

- -

(1) M. Janowitz, 'The Professional Soldier', Glencoe,
     Illinois, Free Press, 1960, page 175.

(2) E. Drukheim, op. cit., page 229.

(3) S.M. Dornbusch, 'The Military Academy as an Assimilating
     Institution', Social Forces, 1955, 33: 317.

Goffman emphasizes the negative aspects of the socialization process in 'total' institutions.[1]   At the outset the neophyte is subjected to what Goffman calls a 'mortification' process in which elements of his personality are stripped off. The cadet at the American Military Academy is stripped of all clues which enable him to retain his original identity.

The socialization processes in military establishments are total in their character.   It is likely therefore that the effects of this socialization may linger on and affect future job choice.   The totality of the socialization process in a military context may in part explain the high percentage of ex-servicemen in the Fire Service today.

Despite the 'total' nature of this socialization many of the firemen I spoke to told me that when they left the army they wanted a job which offered similar rewards.

Army and military life generally offers healthy, vigorous, manly work.   Soldiers are not short of companions.   Dornbusch has argued that the socialization is designed to produce a unified group of recruits.[2]   Further evidence related to this point comes from Emile Durkheim.   He argues that suicide in military establishments occurred as a result of the altruistic spirit of members of the group.   Unlike the civilian population whose suicides are egoistic or anomic, the suicides of military men are altruistic in character.   Companionship is therefore an important part of the intrinsic satisfaction of military life.

The total socialization process which persons leaving the forces have undergone will orient them to seek work in which the same 'altruistic' intrinsic rewards are available.   But it is a

----

(1)   E. Goffman, op cit.,
(2)   S.M. Dornbusch, op. cit.,

mistake to assume that entrants to a new occupation 'suss out'
and accurately assess the rewards that are available in a
particular job.   In addition, persons who have undergone total
socialization may not be aware of the way that the socialization
has affected their needs.   For instance, they may not automatically
realise that their needs after socialization are radically
different from their needs before socialization.   Some of my
respondents were disappointed when they went back to the job of
work they did before joining the army.   They "could not settle
down" and as a result they selected an occupation which offered
some of the rewards of army life.   Thus their post socialization
needs ^more closely related to the rewards obtainable from their job
of work. (1)

         The firemen I interviewed gave me plenty of evidence
which suggested that they had been socialized to 'need' intrinsic
rewards.   Indeed nearly all the sample had worked in occupations
in which intrinsic rewards were considered important.   But the
Fire Service offered something in addition to intrinsic rewards;
the complementarity of work and family roles.   Below are some
of the reasons the firemen gave me for changing their jobs:-

         "There was no real discontent, although I got a big
increase in pay it was not the main reason.   It was the thrill
and challenge." (ex salesman).

         "There was no security in plumbing. This made we want
something like the Fire Brigade." (ex plumber).

         "I travelled all over the country on that job.   Where
the jobs are you go.   This was alright for a single bloke, but

_____

(1)   It could be argued that this process of 'sussing out'
      rewards and needs is very much a hit and miss affair
      unless the actor has detailed knowledge of the intrinsic
      rewards he had from any particular occupation.

when we got married it was certainly not the thing because I
would be away for 6 weeks.   I stuck it to get a trade first."
(ex tile layer).

"I got married and did not think it was fair to be
away." (ex-serviceman).

"The RAF life is not a family life." (ex serviceman).

"I got fed up with the sight of the sea and wanted
to settle down."   (ex-serviceman).

"I left the army because I got married." (ex-serviceman).

"I'd have liked to have stayed on but I met a girl,
you know." (ex-serviceman).

"I left when I got married and we were expecting
children.   She did not like me parachuting." (ex-serviceman).

The multi stranded nature of the fireman's orientation
to work is demonstrated by these quotations.   The recruits to
the Fire Service wanted the intrinsic interest which they
already had in their previous jobs and, in addition, a
compatibility of work with family role relationships.[1]

The most important point is that the recruits were not
sacrificing intrinsic rewards to any appreciable extent.   They
were acquiring what could be called "instrumental" benefits, but
the firemen could be said to have had an expressive orientation
to work however, in so far as they did not sacrifice intrinsic
rewards as they assumed family responsibilities.

Why did the recruits not sacrifice intrinsic for
economic rewards?   The answer, in part, lies in the fact that
many recruits especially the ex-servicemen had undergone "total"

----

(1) By "compatible" I mean that work roles do not prohibit
     the development of family relationships (see tile layer
     and servicemen examples above).

socialization in their previous occupation. It was because of
the intrinsic satisfactions of these occupations that M. Thomas
found that for 18% of her sample "similarity to life in the
forces" was an important reason for deciding to join the Fire
Service.

The ex-serviceman's desire to make work compatible with
family relationships does indicate an orientation to work that
was becoming increasingly instrumental. It seems to be the case
however that instrumentality of this kind is a precondition of
family life rather than something which is individually chosen.
The instrumentality is the result of life cycle factors.
Moreover, in the case of the City firemen intrinsic rewards are
not sacrificed. The recruits reject factory occupations which
offer few intrinsic rewards. The ex-servicemen on becoming
firemen were not rejecting intrinsic satisfactions in work but
were seeking to make these satisfactions compatible with family
role relationships.

Having stated that intrinsic rewards were not sacrificed
it is possible to examine the reasons why the Fire Service was
more compatible with family life than the armed services.

Etzioni has argued that military institutions have
high scope. That is, they control a large number of the total
activities of the participants. By contrast the City Fire
Stations I visited could not be regarded as total institutions.
The 'enemy' that the firemen were fighting took the form of
emergency situations which would normally be dealt with adequately
by a single shift of trained men. The demarcation between the
work of one shift and that of another was clearly defined.
One shift was as good as another for all practicable purposes,

e.g. the situation in which men were rarely asked to handle
extra duties at short notice because one shift was not able to
cope was fairly unusual, though if a bad fire developed it
could happen.   There was little need, therefore, for continued
'extension' of work into leisure.   At the end of the shift
the firemen were free to go home.   They defined themselves as
family men.   Living 'on the square' was seen as somewhat of
a disadvantage.   (See Chapter V on Patterns of Sociability
& Leisure).

Work roles in the Fire Service complemented family
roles rather than being antagonistic to them.   Forces life was
not compatible with family life in the lower ranks - for these
respondents at least.   The ex-servicemen complained of the
high cost of maintaining accommodation for their families
abroad and also of the disruption caused by their moving about.
Thus whilst both occupations were characterized by a high level
of intrinsic rewards the armed services were "unfamilistic"
and the Fire Service was more "familistic."

The fireman's orientation to work can be seen therefore
as being quite complex:

1.   The 'instrumental component of the
      ex-serviceman's orientation to work was
      demonstrated by his desire to give up
      the 'altruistic' forces life (work as an
      end in itself) for work which was less
      'total' in character, and more complementary
      to family role responsibilities.

2.   The 'expressive' component of the
      ex-serviceman's orientation to work was

demonstrated by his desire to take up a
job which offered the same kind of
challenge and companionship as forces
life.

Brown's point about the complexity of most working
persons' orientations to work is upheld by this research.
When the orientation to work of the firemen is considered two
points have to be borne in mind.   First, for firemen,
previous work experience itself had retained a larger influence
on occupational choice than was the case in other groups of
workers (e.g. the Affluent Workers).   Previous work
experience was an important 'moulding force' of work orientation
at the time the decision to change jobs was taken.   Secondly,
the firemen valued an orientation to work that REJECTED parts
of their previous work experience.   But it was not the
intrinsic quality of the work that the firemen were rejecting,
it was the organization form it took.   The firemen believed
that the 'total' character of their work in the armed forces
made it difficult for them to have the kind of family life
they desired.   In so far as they sacrificed the expressive
elements of work in the forces they had an instrumental attitude
to work.   In so far as they desired to retain these qualities
in their work situation by choosing a job that was essentially
similar to the military way of life they had an expressive
orientation to work.   The way this orientation developed is
examined in a later section.

Work Tasks and Conditions of Work.

Firemen need a degree of knowledge over a wide area;[1] they have to handle fire equipment; they must understand their basic 'raw material', i.e. water; they must be able to use breathing apparatus and first aid equipment; they must understand the principles of building construction. Other skills that it is necessary for firemen to learn include: driving heavy goods vehicles; operating turn table ladders; removing accident victims with cutting equipment; having a basic knowledge of fire prevention techniques.

As one fireman told me:

"It's not a run of the mill job. You can't say when you're coming in on a Monday morning, that you're going to be doing such and such a thing. We know that we've got a set routine, that we do drills and start work, but we also know that at any time the bells could go and you could get a working job somewhere. You never get bored, it's impossible to be bored. When you've got men living together and working together at times they get under each other's skin. You're like a load of old women but when the crunch comes you all put together. It's not just a job, it's a way of life. It's not a 9 - 5 job where you come home and forget all about it, especially where kids were involved and you are thinking it especially when you've got kids of your own."

and again:-

"You go back 20-30 years ago when half the chemicals they have now did not exist. All you had then were house fires and perhaps the odd petrol or oil fire, but now you can turn out and perhaps there's something that reacts violently with water - you've got to know what the chemical is, what its properties are, and

---

(1)   Cunningham, op. cit., page 22.

what is likely to happen if you put water on it. There are times
when you put water on petrol or oil fires but these are very high
powered sprays which emulsify the oil and smother it. But if you
use a spray and it is not powerful enough all you are going to
cause is a xxxx great flash over." (expletive deleted).

"No fire is ever dealt with perfectly. The situation
demands an answer, you never give the correct answer but as near
as possible you arrive at the correct solution." (

One fireman mentioned the hazards faced - in this case
a particularly harmful variety of smoke:-

"Oh its terrible. It clings on you. The first time I
had it I had not been in the job very long. They had a place
called Y products on X street and they made coffee tables and
covered them with a P.V.C. covering. There was 30-40 rolls,
at the back of the shop, on fire, and there was a fire at the
front of the shop. We go there. We could not get into the fire
more than about 4 feet inside the building. The windows were
blocked up and naturally we thought it was just the flames from
the fire being held in the building. Well I took a belly full
then. The fire had been put out but the smoke lingered, and
lingered, and lingered, so I put a B.A. set on and went in. They
always say once you've had smoke don't put a B.A. set on and I
learnt the hard way. It was terrible."

Another fireman mentioned the danger from electric shocks:-

"I've gone in and sprayed the place with a jet and the
next think you know is that you're flying across the road somewhere.
You've hit the electric box and the jet, you know, got a belt off
it. If your heart's in a bad state you've had it. Most people
can take a belt, but it does give them a nasty shake up."

Another danger arose from the difficulty of moving safely in smoking conditions. The men could not see where they were going. They were vulnerable to holes in the floor, hanging electric cables, falling ceilings and tiles and a host of other dangers.

When somebody is believed to be trapped inside it is known among the firemen as a "persons reported". A fireman wearing breathing apparatus was usually sent in to search the house:-

"It's a strange experience when you go in first, and its really hot. When you go in you usually have a face mask on you know, but your hands are not covered. It's a queer experience. Have you ever put your hands in boilding water? - you pull them out because its hot but in a hot place there is nowhere to put your hands. At the time I was trying to draw my hands away from the heat but there was nowhere to draw them. I've had some fantastic jobs where I've been frightened to death with a B.A. set on. If you just get an ordinary smoky job you know, cool smoke, I can wander around in that all day it does not worry me. When you get in really hot and you've got jets in one end forcing the heat, it can be flippin' hot."

As can be seen from the tables 50% of the fire calls were for refuse and rubbish fires. Next in importance were derelict buildings and then private homes.

The busiest time of day was 6 - 9 p.m. The latter part of this period was also stand down time. The least busy period was during the night - the hours 12 midnight to 9 a.m. had only 8% of the calls. The morning was also a surprisingly quiet period. The quiet nights meant that if the fireman was lucky he might get some sleep during the long 15 hour night shift.

TABLE 4.3

THE CITY STATIONS: TO SHOW THE INCIDENCE OF CALLS OVER
THE 24 HOUR PERIOD.*

			%
Midnight	-	9 a.m.	8
9 a.m.	-	12 noon	8
Noon	-	3 p.m.	16.5
3 p.m.	-	6 p.m.	21
6 p.m.	-	9 p.m.	28
9 p.m.	-	12 p.m.	18.5
TOTAL			100 %

* Calculated over a nine month period from information given
to me by an officer responsible for statistics.

TABLE 4.4

THE CITY STATIONS: PREMISES INVOLVED IN FIRES. *

	%
REFUSE AND RUBBISH	50
DERELICT BUILDINGS	24
PRIVATE HOUSES	9.5
GRASSLAND	3.5
MOTOR VEHICLES	2
MULTI STOREY FLATS	1.5
SHOPS	1.5
FACTORIES	2
MISCELLANEOUS	6
TOTAL	100

* Calculated over a nine month period from information given
to me by an officer responsible for statistics.

Attitudes and Work Involvement.

A fireman's attitude to his job is complex.   Up until
the introduction of Fire Prevention work amongst the ordinary ranks
firemen had little of importance to interest them when they were
not on operational duties.   They had no important 'other role'
in which they could wholeheartedly involve themselves.   They were
kept at a state of instant readiness to attend an emergency.
This created a situation where they almost 'liked' (in a very
special sense) to turn out.   Generally speaking, in these
circumstances the more fires they attended the more they thought
they were doing a worthwhile job.   However, they did not like
to be thought of as 'liking' fires.   When I asked whether they
'liked' turning out they often replied: "We're not pyromaniacs",
"that's a tricky question, isn't it?"   The respondent's relation-
ship of enjoyment with the prime work task was therefore somewhat
problematic.   They valued their non-participation in the cause
of the emergency.   It is instructive to look at the respondents'
attitudes to their routine role - the station activities and the
training and drilling - in fact, all non-operational work.

During the day, when not firefighting, the firemen
carried out maintenance work, fire prevention duties (recently
introduced into the lower ranks), drills, and attendance at
lectures.   I visited the stations in the evenings when the
firemen were on standby.   This was a clearly constituted period in
which the firemen were free from all but operational duties
(standby was at quite a busy time of the day as can be seen from
Table 4. 3).   If they were not required to turn out they could
pursue a number of leisure activities, e.g. reading, watching
television, playing darts, badminton, snooker and cards.

The emergency focused group effort.   Every incident was

different and the team strove to deal with each one as it arose.
The incident was a challenge to the men.   It demanded a lot from
them.   It united them.

"If I can get to the job, do it properly, I feel good.
If I .... up the driving, take a wrong turn, grind the gears, do
a bad drive, or go across the lights a bit too fast, I feel I've
done a bad job."   (swear word deleted).

"One period we had 30 rescues and 20 of them were kids.
We saved 15 and lost 15.   It may sound something like a football
teams result - in that light we felt good about it.   In all the
fires we always discuss the ones where we got them out, and they
are alive."

"One time x children were involved, x were alright,
x died.   Two machines went and they sent for the Emergency Tender.
I was driving it.   I've never known that machine go so fast.
I won't be exaggerating I bet it was doing 70 m.p.h. down x street.
For a machine of that weight that was moving.   It flew down
there - it was like another sense .... I don't know.   It was
fantastic.   I was very annoyed on that fire though, one of the
blokes had got a ladder up to the window and seeing this kid who
had come to the window, instead of smashing the window and pulling
her out (if we had cut her it would not have mattered as long as
we got her out) he was shouting through the window.   We really
worked hard and gave her mouth to mouth ...."

One officer told me: "Fire situations change very
rapidly. Another officer coming in later will find a completely
different set of conditions.   You've got to be cool headed."

The firemen had to be decisive and able to act quickly.
One of the reasons for the firemen's love of fires was that they
were dealing with an emergency situation which conferred on them

a degree of initiative.   They had a higher level of autonomy in
the fire situation than on the station itself.[1]

TABLE 4. 5

SOURCES OF SATISFACTION MENTIONED BY THE FIREMEN*
N = 36

	%
WORTHWHILE JOB / SAVING LIFE	32
COMPANIONSHIP	20
VARIETY / INTEREST / UNPREDICTABILITY	15
THE EXCITEMENT / THE FIRES	15
LIKE THE FORCES / UNIFORMED JOB	6
SECURITY / MONEY / PENSION	8
O T H E R	4
T O T A L	100%

*   Some firemen mentioned more than one source of satisfaction;
     8 mentioned 2 reasons, 2 mentioned 3 reasons, 1 mentioned
     4 reasons.

Fire fighting is team work.   The firemen told me that
they could not afford to have a real enemy on the job.   It was
easy to "see someone off" because "you'd just have to shut a door
when they were inside."

In the larger of the two stations I visited the team of
18 or 19 firemen gave plenty of choice for friends.   One of the
firemen on the smaller station mentioned the challenge of working
with only 5 firemen.   This fireman had worked in the larger station
but had moved to the smaller one:-   "There's more responsibility
_ _

(1)   The fire station was known to the firemen as the fireground.

there being only five men instead of twelve. It does you a hell of a lot of good. Actually I think what they should do is swap the blokes round up here and get the younger men in from down there up here and keep a constant turnover going. It's a good think - it makes you buck your ideas up especially if you've got some of the slower kind. They are prepared to hide (which you do get a lot of with there being so many men). They stand at the back all the time and let the same six or seven do the work. There's always three that hang back, whistling and banging doors. Now you can't blame the older men for taking it easy or slow when they've only got a couple of years to do, but for the younger men it would be a good thing."

The firemen were crucially aware of the unusual nature of their work cycle and were aware of the disadvantages of long periods of leisure in work time. They also felt that their operations and main operational activities were easily distinguishable even to a member of the public. With regard to these points they commented:-

"A lot of outsiders, other workers where they work in factories, they look down upon it. 'What happens if my house is on fire when you are having a pint - do you sit back and finish your pint'?"

"The public think we sit all day playing snooker, till a fire comes, then we dash out and squirt some water regardless of any damage we might do."

"Firemen - if they don't take an interest in cards, or active sports, you often see them wandering around aimless. They seem to get bored or fed up if they are not on a fire."

The respondents sometimes resented the public's image of them as 'snooker-playing idiots' - in fact, most of the firemen's

views of the public's image of the Fire Service referred to their

relative rolelessness when not actually fighting fires.

The contrast of the relaxed informal atmosphere of the

station with the action of the fireground was a basic feature of

the work situation:

"If anyone came in the dining room some nights they'd

think everyone was potty.   Grown men sat there with roulette,

roll a penny (with a little roller - five goes per person) one of

the blokes with a scraper saying: 'and its a goin and its a

missin'. He'd scrape the money up 'next please, roll up let's

have your money'."

Games such as these could be played during 'stand down'

times in the evenings.   On standby the men were free to move

around the station.   During the days the men were assigned jobs,

did drills or lectures.   "Provided the jobs are done nobody

grumbles" was how one fireman described it.

The games were soon forgotten when they turned out,

however:

"No matter what you are doing it is completely forgotten.

I was in the cinema once and I saw this film in which a bell was

pressed.   I got up. It's brain washing."

However, the routine periods are not all fun and games.

The respondents mentioned that the atmosphere in the station

deteriorated if there was a long period with few or no emergencies

or turn outs.   In the pilot study I interviewed firemen from

town and country stations with only 250 or 300 calls a year

compared with the 4,000 which the large city station had to deal with.

The firemen from these smaller stations were pleased when

fires came along:

"The longer you go without a fire the more moping and

moaning there is. I would be happy if we were called out more often as it can get monotonous here."

These firemen thought they were under-utilised rather than over-utilised. They spoke of the big improvement in the atmosphere in the station after they came back from a fire situation in which they had been effective (when they had achieved a 'good step').

In the city station the enthusiasm for fires was still there. But the emphasis was on getting good turn outs to the many incidents they already had rather than wanting more action from individual fires as such. I asked the question: "Do you ever find yourself waiting for a fire?" Here are some of the answers:

"No, only when you first join."

"You don't hang about waiting for a job."

"Fires to me are just dangerous and take years off your life."

"When you are a recruit you wait for them, but after a while it wears off."

A large proportion qualified their answers:

"There are times when you get a lot of monotonous work and you would rather go out to a fire."

"When you are doing a boring job, sometimes you feel like it and sometimes not. You are hoping for a job then just to break your days up."

"I take it as it comes."

There were those who did wait for the emergencies:

"I wait all the time, that's what we are here for."

"You get a feeling something is going to happen."

"Fires attract each other - they come in threes and fours - when you start you get busy."

"We are due for a big one. It's a long time since one

happened. The big one always comes."

"Yes, we're due for a fatal - the law of averages."

"Up to tonight we've had quite a lull on our watch."

"You look forward to going out - don't get me wrong, I'm not a sadist, but it's what I joined the job for."

Whereas the majority of the firemen from the country stations wanted to turn out more, only a small proportion of the city firemen wanted more fires as such.

To assess the firemen's attitude to station/routine activities, I asked them: "What effect does having to suddenly get up and go to a fire have on the other activities you are doing?" The M. Thomas survey indicates that firemen do not enjoy cleaning duties very much, but I wanted to find out whether there were any station activities which were potentially enjoyable and which the firemen did not like to 'break off' or cease in an emergency. The replies were:

"Station work is just filling in time. Turning out is part of the job. I found it annoying at first."

"I don't get too involved in anything. If I'm watching television I take it as it comes, otherwise you can end up with sour grapes if you miss the end of something. You must not lose sight of what you are here for."

"When you come back from a fire you carry on where you left off - there's nothing essential to be done."

"It's very exasperating if you are having a meal or on the toilet, or enjoying a game, but normally it does not make much difference."

"I know we moan about it but afterwards it's a good laugh because you think well, 'the lousy so and so caught us at it again'."

The application of technology to the emergency situations

the firemen dealt with could not be described as alienative to
any significant degree. Every fire situation was considered to
be unique and thus required a slightly or, as the case may be, a
completely different use of equipment. If the fire situation
changed quickly (as it often did) the use of technology had to be
changed to meet the new requirements. The technology therefore
did not control the firemen. It was the interaction of firemen
with fire situations which controlled the technology. Because
every fire was 'unique' the applicability of a particular item of
equipment was often highly specific. The fireman had to know the
circumstances in which particular pieces of equipment could be
applied. The need for flexibility in the use of technology and
the need for the skill of the fireman in applying the technology
was one reason for the high level of intrinsic interest in the job.
This contrasted very strongly with the effects of technology on
certain groups of factory workers. The firemen were aware of this
and for this reason the idea of working in a factory for high
intrinsic rewards did not appeal to them. Most of the firemen
in my sample preferred their job as a fireman to the alternative
work which was available to them in factories. Hardly any of
the firemen in my sample had ever worked for long periods in a
factory.[1]   Here are some of their comments about factory work:

"In a factory you are repeating yourself over and over
again. On the station you have freedom of movement to a certain
extent."

"In a factory you are indoors all the time with no time
for socialising with your mates."

"Factory work is against all my principles. I like

_____

(1)   The ex-engineers were a significant group however.

change. In a factory you can't use your own initiative."

Despite the fact that few of the firemen had worked in factories for long periods some had, nevertheless, worked in factories for short periods. Some of the firemen with army backgrounds mentioned the difficulties they faced in getting used to factory work. It was because of these difficulties that they had decided to become firemen.

There was another important difference between the fire station and most factory work situations. There was little conflict with 'management' over the application of technology. Undoubtedly the ordinary fireman felt that he could carry on with the job of fighting the fire without being told what to do by the officers, but the significance of this is minimised when it is realised that not even the officers could create emergencies (work) for the ordinary fireman.[1] A fire chief could not increase the number of fires his firemen had to attend. This contrasts with factory work situations where, e.g. a 'capitalist' manager may decide to make the workers increase their output for the purpose of increasing profit.

The firemen were allowed a fairly high level of autonomy and independence on the fireground and at the station. However, there was some evidence of conflict between some of the officers and some ordinary firemen. These conflicts did not stand out as major grievances in the stations I visited. However, other sources have indicated that relationships between officers and those whom they command are often a major problem. (Evidence of the

----

(1)   The exception to this was the routine work situations at
      the fire station. Cleaning the stairs or polishing
      brass was work which was not seen as being absolutely
      necessary by the firemen. It was seen as work 'created'
      by the officers.

problematic nature of this relationship is given by M. Thomas:

"They should stop treating firemen as kids. On this station they are inclined to do that." [1]

M. Thomas quotes several firemen who speak in a similar vein. I would argue that the 'Human Relations' approach to industrial relations is likely to be more successful in a situation of more man to man contact (where technology does not control action) than in factory situations where technology controls work. [2]

The amount of fire prevention work carried out by the fire authorities has been increasing since 1959, but until the Cunningham Report fire prevention remained a specialized aspect of Fire Service work. Cunningham recommended that the ordinary fireman be given the opportunity to enrich his work role by the addition of fire prevention work. The Report argued that firemen were unhappy about doing boring cleaning duties when not attending fires and that they needed something more interesting and worth-while. Also there was a need for a growing emphasis on fire prevention work. The national cost of making good damage caused by fire was steadily rising. The decision to meet this need by training ordinary firemen to do the job, however, was not an easy one. Fire prevention work had remained a specialized activity for so long. There are three factors to be taken into account:

1. The increasing cost of fire damage.

2. The psychological costs of firemen doing relatively unimportant work when not firefighting.

3. The desire of the Fire Brigades Union to upgrade the image of the firefighter. The Union was aware that the removal of the routine parts of the job would enhance the status of the fireman.

----

(1) Op. cit., page 65.

(2) For example, the 'Affluent Worker' sample where the technological influence was extremely important.

The Union were therefore in favour of the introduction of fire prevention work.

Two main attitudes to the recent introduction of fire prevention work were apparent.   One attitude was that fire prevention work was not complementary to fire fighting.   Firemen with this attitude opposed the change because they argued that it would impair their efficiency as firefighters.   By contrast a larger group saw fire prevention work as being compatible with efficient fire fighting.

Most of my own sample were efficiency oriented.   They all cared about obtaining a good turn out to fires.   The difference between the groups lay in part in the fact that one group thought efficiency would be affected while the other did not.   But it was not only efficiency which decided the attitude to fire prevention work.   Status considerations and contentment with what was familiar were other reasons why the change was resisted.

The fact that efficiency in turning out mattered to the firemen was demonstrated by the opposition to the Fire Service reorganization necessitated by local government change.   Many of those who saw fire fighting as complementary with fire prevention nevertheless opposed reorganization because they believed that the old system produced a more efficient turning out process.   Firemen who believed that fire prevention was complementary with fire fighting nevertheless opposed the introduction of 'bureaucratic' elements which they thought would slow them down, e.g. "A few years ago the Union ordered us to stop going through the lights on red but I still go through because its my responsibility to get the machine there; you can be waiting at a set of lights for three minutes and that's a long time."

Firemen with the antagonistic orientation to fire
prevention work saw themselves exclusively as operational firemen,
as 'ladder men' as one such fireman described himself.   They did
not like the collar and tie image of fire prevention men.
I present below some of the things they said:-

"I don't like F.P. work, I'd rather be out fighting fires.
We've been asked to inspect premises like factories and workshops
etc., O.K., they constitute a risk but the number of fires we get
while people are on the premises is very, very few.   We'd be far
better employed doing house-to-house prevention.   Taking a
machine round house-to-house is far better than going to factories,
because it can result in a slight delay in turn out, for a start,
whereas at a house you put the bells on and you are there."

And:

"If we go over the road we could be on the top floor.
The driver stays by the radio downstairs.   The bell has got to
come over the radio to him and he has got to write this call out.
Then he's got to get on the air to the lads on top.   If they can't
hear him he's got to put his klaxons on. We've got to come from
the top floor downwards and away we go.   But time is essence in
this job and half a minute can make all the difference between
life and death."

Opposition was expressed strongly in some cases:-

"Eighteen out of twenty don't want to do fire prevention.
Nowadays, you've got to do more fire prevention work, you've got
to be a 'brief-case' man, a collar and tie man - if twenty men were
to come in here and give you an honest answer eighteen would say
they don't want it.   You've got to do it to prove you're worth the
extra money.   You take the casualty officer on duty at the
hospital.   He's on night duty.   If nobody goes in they don't say

to him get in that back room and start clearing it up.   But the
people who pay us have said 'Its not good enough firemen just going
to fires, they've got to do something else'."   He continued:
"the boffins, the clever people can't get it into their heads that
our prime purpose is to fight fires.   In a few years they'll have
us doing the street lighting.   There's enough work to do in your
own field basically.   I want to look at stuff that involves me as
an operational fireman.   When you get blokes leaving who have been
here 18-20 years there's something wrong."

This man rejected the 'other role' that was being thrust
upon him.   He objected to the change of status: "Its like asking
a man who works with a shovel to get his collar and tie on".
Secondly, he argued that they had enough work anyway but he also
acknowledged that "relationships tend to stray when there are
a few fires".   He therefore regarded the discontinuities inherent
in the role more tolerable than the burden of taking on extra
duties.

His was not the only objection however - there were many
others.   Some argued that it would slow down the turn out times
and that the two roles were incompatible:-

"I think it's good but I think they are going to expect
too much of us.   Last year we had 4000 calls at this station alone,
so it's not going to give us much time for F.P. work.   There will
be a delay - say they go to a four storey mill and they are making
the routine check.   Well, there would be two minutes lost.   It's
good if the proper people and not the firemen could do it in a way.
I'd prefer not to do it really."

And again:-

"We did some Fire Prevention work at a factory.   The
manager was very good.   He showed us all round.   We had to dash

out because we had a fire call. We went to a derelict and got
all dirtied up and then had to come back here and got cleaned up
then had to go back. But of course he'd gone into a meeting with
the directors so he could not come back and see us. Therefore we
had to wait a quarter of an hour until they had sorted someone else
out to show us round. This is happening all the time. Really,
F.P. work is a good idea but unfortunately I don't think it is
working out."

And again:-

"At the moment we are not paid enough to take on the
responsibility they want us to take on. If I had a choice I would
not do F.P. on the rate we are on now."

"Actual fire prevention with factories and schools I'm
not too keen on really. Now if you said 'go to some householders
and give them some advice' that I would like."

A larger group of firemen were in favour of the change.
They said it would add interest to their work:-

"It's great - I like it. It's interesting, and I am
getting out and about meeting different people."

And:

"It must be a good thing if we can prevent something from
going up. Not enough has been done in the last 20 years but they
seem to be doing it a little too fast now."

And:

"It's good. It acquaints you with the jobs that you will
be going to. You get an awareness of the problems of meeting all
the various acts. Before a fireman would say, 'Did you see the
state of that - why haven't the Fire Prevention got on to him?'
But now that you've been round and been through the whole rigmarole
yourself, what with the non-availability of building materials you

appreciate what everybody is up against."

And again:

"I enjoyed looking at a factory we went to the other day.
They had made loads of alterations to the building.   They give
you one of those planned drawings of a building and they's say
'Right, I want you to go and check these fire resisting doors and
check the fire exits and make sure that they still do the same jobs
in the shed - see if they are still airing rooms.'   On the last
one we went to they had 4000 gallons of fuel stores underground
that was not on the plans.   They had built two new sheds, they'd
got a paintshop with an old asbestos roof on it.   None of this was
on the plans and you're thinking 'this place will go like a bomb'.
It is interesting because you are the fireman and you are going in
there, and you are thinking of a fire situation.   You are trying
to weigh the place up to see what it would be like in a fire."

And again:

"I like it - it has made the job more interesting.   I mean
before we did this it was a case of just cleaning the machines, day
in and day out which sometimes got boring, especially if we had not
been out during the day.   With Fire Prevention work you go out
with the machine and you can go round factories, nursing homes,
children's homes and you find out what you are going to.   With F.P.
work it helps you to know what type of place it is, factories
especially."

And again:

"The days are more interesting now.   When I first joined
ten years ago, every turn out, if the appliance was wet, you had
to swill it off and leather it off.   All the brass has to be
sparkling.   Every day was the same, just polishing brass.   That's
slowly been phased out.   The days are more interesting."

The firemen did not wish fires on anybody.   They preferred

'property' fires to 'persons reported' fires.   However, a high
percentage of the property fires were routine, repetitive, uneventful
incidents such as burning or smouldering derelict houses.   Some
of the 'property' fires were not as meaningful as the human fires
which gave the challenge of a meaningful crisis situation.   If
firemen did not wish fires 'on people', they did not however like
to attend meaningless routine incidents.   There was thus a tension
between the extremes of 'persons reported' and 'derelicts'.

In order to find out how this tension was resolved I asked
yhe firemen what types of incidents they most liked and disliked.
In my sample nearly 50% preferred 'big' fires which did not involve
people.   The big fires were meaningful.   Here are some comments
from firemen who preferred such 'big' fires:-

"I like to stand outside slobbing it in."

"I like going to a large fire provided there's no life
at stake."

"I like it simple, where there's no life involved.   When
there's people involved it upsets you, especially the children."

"In a factory fire you've got more time to think.   If
you're on the end of a jet you can soak somebody and they can soak
you.   But if someone is involved there'd be nothing.   All your
concentration is on getting hold of that somebody and you don't
think of anything else.   But on a factory fire you can do anything.
You play games involving water.   It's not always like that, but
as you put out the fire and test your capabilities you've got a
certain sort of humour which you don't get in a 'persons reported'.
You can come back to the station after the job is finished and then
you start larking about, but on a house fire ...*fire*"

"If people are not involved you can enjoy a good fire.
If people are involved it's not a very pleasant thing."

12% of my sample liked 'people' fires. Most of them specified that they only liked this kind of fire when there was a successful outcome (if people were rescued). They were, in this case, not wishing death on people but rather expressing the view that 'risk' provided meaningful work and job satisfaction.

"I like house fies where you are called in and do an efficient job."

"I like the ones you can put out quickly. If you can save a life you can get more out of that than anything but I dislike it when people are trapped."

10% of my sample disliked 'meaningless' fires or rather they disliked this type of fire most.

"I like factory fires but I don't like refuse or derelicts; in nine out of ten cases the demolition men set fire to it - it is needless."

Liking 'persons reported' was a difficult thing for a fireman to admit. In reality anyway the fireman did not choose the fire he was called out to.

By asking the firemen what fires they liked and disliked I was presenting them with a moral dilemma. Were they to be seen to enjoy 'people' fires[1] even with the human risk and the job satisfaction they therefore afforded? 'People' fires offered the firemen the chance of a highly successful outcome. The fireman might be able to rescue someone, and this is "the best thing" that can happen to a fireman. Nevertheless the 'people' fires presented a high risk situation. Instead of rescuing someone the firemen could merely find 'stiffs'. For most firemen therefore 'people' fires were not something they could opt for. Factory fires were more 'popular' because they offered relatively meaningful

_____

(1)   'Person' fires were known to the firemen as 'persons reported'.

work with no risk to human life.

It is not contradictory to argue that firemen did not necessarily 'like' fires but that the fires nevertheless had an integrative effect on the work group. One of the themes (emerging from the research itself) to be explained later is that emergency situations bind firemen together.

From the data it can be seen that the fires that were enjoyed most were the big factory fires. Fires involving human life were not enjoyed overall. Some comments from the firemen in my sample show the depth of feeling for 'person' fires:-

"When there's people involved people get confused. They wonder whether they are doing the right thing or whether they could be doing it better. When there's nobody involved you can go about the job with a clear mind."

"The atmosphere on the station when they've had children, ooh! you could cut it. You remember them all ..... I cannot remember the names. We have one lad here just a bit shorter than me and he'd say 'Oh, do you rmember Mr. Smith?' and I'd say 'Who?'. Then he mentions the street straight away.   This is where the joking comes in, I think 'Who the hell is Mr. Smith?'.

'You remember Y street.'

'Oh, that was his name.'

'That was Mr. Smith.' "

and   "Children, they could be mine. I'd rather have a rubbish fire than a fire with three kids anyday."

and again   "These questions, you know, obviously make firemen sound a little like pyromaniacs. A fireman hates to go to a fire where people lose their home because this is so irreplaceable to an individual. People's personalities, books and photographs - very, very personal." .... "Nobody likes fires, but if you have

a fire and its going to be a good one there's a tendency to prefer
them in industry."

This last quote illustrates how sensitive firemen were
about 'liking' their job.   They valued their dissociation from
the cause of the emergency situation.   Nevertheless the emergencies
were the prerequisite for total work group integration and interest
in the job.   The serious emergencies called for the complete
involvement and co-operation of the whole team.   The less serious
emergencies offered opportunities for teamwork of a less urgent
type and provided a break from the station environment.   In one
sense, every turn out was an emergency because until they arrived
the firemen did not know exactly what to expect.

The Orientation to Work of Firemen.

I have argued in the section on recruitment and
socialization experience that the firemen had an expressive
orientation to work.   There are difficulties, however, in developing
an ideal type 'expressive orientation to work concept'.   Unlike
the 'instrumental orientation' the expressive orientation is multi
dimensional since it includes both intrinsic and economic elements.
This is particularly true if one adopts the view that all
orientations are deviations from instrumentalism.   The difficulty
of describing and analysing orientations undoubtedly derives from
their 'relative' character.   Nevertheless the question can be
asked: What proportion of the basically instrumental infrastructure
must consist of intrinsic elements for the orientations to be
considered expressive in nature?

A second problem concerns the stability of the orientations
to work.   The firemen in general undoubtedly had an expressive
orientation to work at the time of joining the Fire Service, as
revealed by the M. Thomas Survey.   But did this orientation prevail

when the firemen had been in the Service for a period of time?

An attempt will be made to answer these questions in this section.   Data which I have culled from the M. Thomas Survey indicates that the orientation to work of the firemen interviewed did in fact change in the direction of instrumentalism.   The expressive element remained important however.   The Tables 4.6, 4.7 and 4.8   are based on figures from the M. Thomas Survey.   In this survey the following questions were asked:-

"Have you at any time seriously considered resigning from the Fire Service?"

and   "What made you stay?"

Four out of ten of all men in the Fire Service had seriously considered resigning.   Forty per cent of the sample, ten, could be considered as definitely having experienced a shift in their orientation to the job.   M. Thomas noted that the firemen who had joined because they thought the pay was good were disappointed by the existing pay levels.   Another group who had joined because of the excitement tended to be disappointed when they found this absent in practice.   There were thus expressive and instrumental reasons that this 40% considered resigning.

I have classified (as far as possible) the answers given in the Thomas Report as being 'instrumental' and 'expressive' responses.[1]   Whereas in Table 4.6 expressive responses figure as important for 46% of the firemen's desire to leave, in Table 4.7 they account for only 28% of the reasons for deciding to stay.   It is clearly the 'instrumental' rewards which 'keep the firemen at it'.

----

(1)   Unfortunately the number of unclassified responses is
       quite large.

TABLE 4. 6.

REASONS FOR CONSIDERING RESIGNING*

	JUNIOR RANKS
MORE EXPRESSIVE	%
OFFICERS' ATTITUDE / BEHAVIOUR	16
GENERAL DISCONTENT / DISILLUSIONMENT	8
BOREDOM / MONOTONOUS WORK	5
WANTED TO DO SOMETHING ELSE	4
TOO MUCH CLEANING / KITCHEN DUTIES	3
HOURS / WORKING AT NIGHT	10
TOTAL EXPRESSIVE	46
MORE INSTRUMENTAL	%
P A Y	38
POOR PROMOTION PROSPECTS	8
DOMESTIC REASONS	7
HOUSING	3
OFFER OF ALTERNATIVE EMPLOYMENT	9
TOTAL INSTRUMENTAL	65
UNCLASSIFIABLE	%
O T H E R ₋	9
WANTED TO EMIGRATE	4
TOTAL UNCLASSIFIABLE	13
T O T A L	124 **
% Base (last occasion considered resigning)	646

** Adds to more than 100% as some respondents gave more than one reason.

* M. Thomas, op. cit., page 82. I have classified M. Thomas' data into 'instrumental' and 'expressive' categories.

TABLE 4.7

REASONS FOR DECIDING TO STAY *

	%
MORE 'EXPRESSIVE'	
CALL OF THE FIRE SERVICE	11
PERSUADED TO STAY BY SENIOR OFFICER	4
RELUCTANCE TO TAKE THE STEP OF LEAVING	3
DIDN'T WANT TO THROW AWAY TRAINING	4
EXPECTED IMPROVEMENT IN CONDITIONS	6
TOTAL 'EXPRESSIVE'	28
MORE 'INSTRUMENTAL'	
PENSION	11
SECURE EMPLOYMENT	8
HOUSING	8
IMPROVEMENTS IN PAY	7
PERSONAL / DOMESTIC REASON	14
PROMOTION	4
FINANCIAL DISADVANTAGES OF ALTERNATIVE EMPLOYMENT	4
TOO OLD TO DO ANYTHING ELSE	2
CLOSE TO RETIREMENT	2
TOTAL 'INSTRUMENTAL'	60
UNCLASSIFIABLE	
FAILED TO GET / DID NOT FANCY OTHER JOB	14
TRANSFERRED	3
CHANGED MY MIND (no reason given)	7
STILL INTEND TO LEAVE	6
OTHER	6
TOTAL UNCLASSIFIABLE	36
T O T A L	124 **
% BASE (last occasion considered resigning)	646

** Adds to more than 100% as some respondents gave more than one reason.

* M. Thomas, op. cit., page 82. I have classified M. Thomas' data into 'instrumental' and 'expressive' categories.

TABLE 4. 8.

WAYS IN WHICH THE FIRE SERVICE HAD NOT COME UP TO EXPECTATIONS [*]

MORE EXPRESSIVE	%
LACK OF EXCITEMENT / INTERST / ACTIVITY	31
STATION CLEANING / MAINTENANCE	14
COMRADESHIP / SOCIAL LIFE	10
LOW DISCIPLINE	4
LOW STANDARD OF EQUIPMENT	3
LOW STANDARD OF RECRUITS	3
CONDITIONS IN GENERAL	3
TOO MANY OFFICERS	2
TOTAL EXPRESSIVE	94
MORE INSTRUMENTAL	%
P A Y	30
HOURS	12
PROMOTION PROSPECTS	9
TOTAL INSTRUMENTAL	51
UNCLASSIFIABLE	%
STATUS / PUBLIC IMAGE OF FIRE SERVICE	6
OTHER	13
TOTAL UNCLASSIFIABLE	19
T O T A L	164 [**]
% BASE (thought life in the Fire Service was worse than expected	414

[**]   Adds to more than 100% as some respondents mentioned more than one way in which the Fire Service had not come up to expectations.

[*]   M. Thomas, op. cit., page 81.   I have classified M. Thomas' data into 'instrumental' and 'expressive' categories.

I have evidence from my own data that unpromoted firemen who had been in the Service a long time found the intrinsic rewards less satisfying.   These firemen told me that they found the work a thrill and a challenge when they first joined but that over the years the excitement had slowly decreased.   They now did the job mainly for the money.

Tables 4.6, 4.7 and 4.8   clearly demonstrate the 'multi-stranded' nature of the fireman's orientation to work.   Moreover even if the 'ideal type' expressive orientation is difficult to operationalize in this context, the orientation of firemen can certainly be described as 'expressive' when compared to the 'Affluent Workers'.

TABLE 4. 9.

FACTORS MOST IMPORTANT IN WORK

SECURITY	5.8
P A Y	5.6
INTEREST AND VARIETY	5.5
WORKMATES	4.6
WORKING CONDITIONS	3.1
SUPERIORS	2.7
UNION	1.8

Table 4.9 is based on my own data.   It clearly shows the 'multi-stranded' orientation to work of firemen and this contrasts very strongly with the 'single stranded' instrumental orientation of the 'Affluent Workers'.   I asked the firemen: "Here are some of the things which are thought important about a job.   Which are the most important for you in the Fire Brigade?" I gave each fireman a list showing pay, security, interest and variety, work-mates, superiors, working conditions, and trade unions. (not in that order)   Each fireman was asked to list the factors in order of importance.

The answers were scored in the following way: first
choice was given 7 points, second choice 6 points and so on - the
last choice getting a score of 1.   Many respondents listed items
as being of equal importance and this tended to make the scores a
little higher than they would otherwise have been.   However it
can be seen from the results below that firemen assigned a much
greater importance to 'interest' and 'variety' as a variable than
the 'Affluent Worker' did.

Two criteria were used to assess firemen's levels of
involvement with their workmates.   Firstly, the men were asked
the question: "How would you feel if you were moved away from
the men who work near you?   Would you feel, very upset, fairly
upset, not much bothered, or not bothered at all?".   Table 4. 10
shows the firemen compared with the 'Affluent Workers'.

TABLE 4. 10.

FEELINGS ABOUT BEING MOVED AWAY FROM PRESENT WORKMATES -
Firemen and Goldthorpe et al's Assemblers and
'Affluent Workers'.

	% Firemen	% Assemblers *	% 'Affluent Workers' *
Very upset	12	5	4
Fairly upset	42	27	23
Not much bothered	34	35	32
Not bothered at all	12	33	36
Other, D.K., O.N.A.	0	1	5
Totals	100	100	100

*   Goldthorpe et al., op. cit., Vol. 1, page 51.

The firemen were more upset than the 'Affluent Workers'.
They were relatively expressive in their relationship with each
other.   Firemen associate informally with each other in pubs and
clubs to a greater degree than the 'Affluent Workers'.(See Table 5.7)

The second criterion was the level of participation in work based clubs and Union activities.

Work based clubs: the firemen's level of participation was found to be nearly the same as that of the 'Affuent Workers'. 20% attended work based clubs on a regular basis, and 25% did so on an occasional basis. The firemen had a clear conception of the boundary between work and leisure. They approved of the fact that their role as firemen did not 'extend' to a great degree into their leisure hours. Despite the relatively greater opportunities that the firemen had for sporting activities after work (the basis for these activities was established in work itself) the relatively low rate of participation emphasizes that a relatively clear division between work and non-work did exist.

Union meetings: It was easy for the firemen to attend Union meetings. The 24 hour duty system meant that on average they would be able to attend 1 in 3 Union meetings at work itself.[1] The high level of attendance at Union meetings was concomitant with an apathetic attitude to Union affairs. Their high level of attendance is explained in part by the ease with which they could attend:

(a) the larger station was a Union branch.

(b) the firemen could often attend during work time itself.

For these reasons the scores of instrumentation for firemen given in Table 4. 11 (see page 92) should be treated with caution.

_ _

(1) Provided they were not 'turned out'.

TABLE 4. 11.

SCORES OF 'INSTRUMENTALISM' FOR FIREMEN AND 'AFFLUENT WORKERS'[*]

Score	Firemen (N = 42) %	'Affluent Workers' (N = 229) %
6	0	5
5	3	31
4	19	28
3	33	25
2	28	9
1	17	2
TOTALS	100	100

* Goldthorpe et al., op. cit., Vol. 1, page 161.

= = = = = = = = = =

V.   PATTERNS OF SOCIABILITY AND LEISURE.

This chapter will consider the extent to which the firemen constituted an occupational community.   What are the central defining characteristics of an occupational community? G. Salaman has discussed the concept of community in detail.[1] He argues firstly that members of occupational communities see themselves in terms of their occupational roles.   Secondly members of occupational communities share a reference group composed of members of the occupational community.   Thirdly members of occupational communities associate with other members of their occupation in preference to outsiders.   In addition, Salaman also has noted two conditioning determinants of occupational communities.   One is marginality.[2]   Members of marginal occupations regard their occupational colleagues as the only people whose opinions matter, because only they share their view of the nature of the occupation and the 'real' status worthiness of its members.[3]   The second factor is the extent to which the organization embraces the individual.

This second factor is particularly important.   Etzioni argued that organizations can vary in their range of pervasiveness, i.e. the number of activities in or outside the organization for which the organization sets norms.[4]

_ _

(1)   G. Salaman, 'Community and Occupation', Cambridge Papers in Sociology 4, Cambridge University Press, page 21.

(2)   Salaman writes that the essential feature of marginality is that people wish to belong to some group but are denied admission to it.   An occupation can be described as marginal when members identify, and wish to associate with members of a higher-status group and when those ambitions are unsuccessful.

(3)   Ibid., page 32.

(4)   'A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations', op. cit., page 163.

"the more perswasive an organization is, the greater the effort to maintain effective control." [1]   Organizational scope, which is related to but distinct from pervasiveness, is determined by the number of activities carried out jointly by the participants in a particular organization. [2]

The Fire Service is not an organization which is 'all perswasive'.   It does not possess the 'total' characteristics of army life, for instance.   In the stations I visited there was a well defined division of work and leisure.   Kinship ties were as important as work ties in the respondents' non-work life.

With regard to assessing the importance of relatives in the respondents' lives I asked the questions: "Could I ask about what relatives you have?"   "Where do they live?"   and "How far do you keep in touch with them?"

In 75% of the cases most relatives lived in and around the city.   The majority of firemen remained close to their family of origin.   The sample of 42 married firemen can be divided into two groups:-   those with service connections of some sort (N = 17) and those without any military service (N = 24). Some 73% of the service sample lived in the same region as one set of the couple's parents and 53% lived near both sets of parents.   Of the non-service sample 85% lived near at least one set of parents and 66% lived near both sets of the couple's parents.

The non-service sample had a higher percentage of 'locals' but the service percentage itself is quite high in view of the fact that the men had spent some years away from the region while in the services.

----

(1)   'Modern Organizations', op. cit.,   page 71.
(2)   Ibid..

Table 5.1 also shows that in the great majority of cases 'kin' were more likely to be entertained in the home or 'had round' for the evening than other groups of friends.   Like the 'Affluent Worker' sample, a large percentage of the firemen reported entertaining only relatives at home.   25% said they did no entertaining[1] as is the case with 'Affluent Workers'.   Social occasions of the kind in question were not, in the main, particularly frequent occurrences in the firemen's lives - taking place on average somewhat less than once a month.   As Goldthorpe et al., say: "Such a situation then, can scarcely be taken as demonstrating the spread of typically middle-class relations and modes of sociability.   On the contrary, it would more obviously suggest the persistence of the long-established working class belief that the home is a place reserved for kin and for very 'particular' friends alone." [2]

Goldthorpe et al., report that for the 'Affluent Workers' neighbours were of comparable importance to kin in the respondents' associational patterns.[3]   For the city firemen, however, relatives were definitely the predominant source of companionship. As Table 5.2 shows neighbours did not increase in importance when relatives were physically distant.   Relatives remained the most important source of companionship.

---

(1)   In retrospect this question could have been probed more fully.

(2)   Ibid., Vol. 3, page 92.

(3)   Neighbours were defined as persons living within ten minutes walk.

TABLE 5. 1

LEISURE TIME SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS OF CITY FIREMEN.

N = 42

	KIN	NEIGHBOURS	WORKMATES	FIREMEN'S WIVES	OTHERS		TOTAL MENTIONED	AVERAGE PER RESPONDENT
	Percentage							
PEOPLE WITH WHOM SPARE TIME IS MOST OFTEN SPENT	33	22	22	0	23	100	57	1:3
PEOPLE WITH WHOM FIREMEN SAY THEIR WIVES SPEND MOST TIME	33	21	9	16	21	100	55	1.3
COUPLES ENTERTAINED AT HOME (N = 38)	31	4	WIVES WORKMATES 6	Firemen 16	19	76*	37	.97 (N = 38)

*   24% said they did not entertain couples for a meal or for the evening.

TABLE 5. 2

SOURCES OF REGULAR SPARE-TIME COMPANIONS BY LOCATION OF MAJORITY OF COUPLE'S KIN

LOCATION OF MAJORITY OF COUPLE'S KIN	KIN	NEIGHBOURS	FIREMEN	WIVES WORKMATES	OTHER		TOTAL MENTIONED
			Percentage				
IN OR NEAR CITY N = 27*	35	15	20	5	25	100	64
OUTSIDE CITY N = 9*	28	20	20	8	28	100	25

* 6 were unclassifiable.

On certain dimensions the firemen showed a similar degree
of 'privatization' to the 'Affluent Workers'. They both
entertained in the home to the same degree; they both participated
in the care of young children to a relatively high degree; the
firemen, like the 'Affluent Workers', had a low level of
participation in formal associations. A relatively high proportion
(62%) said that they did not attend any clubs outside of and
unconnected with the Fire Service. Of those who did belong to
outside clubs 25% belonged to one club and 13% attended two clubs.
This is an even lower level than that for the 'Affluent Workers'.[1]

Unlike the majority of the 'Affluent Workers' the firemen
had not moved away, permanently, from their place of origin.
But in spite of this the firemen were more 'privatized' in certain
respects than the 'Affluent Workers'. This raises the question of
whether the act of moving away is especially significant for the
privatization hypothesis. Is not the nature of the job more
significant than Goldthorpe et al., suggest? Why do they not
discuss in more detail the effects of shiftwork on social life?

Shiftwork itself is important. Many firemen stated that
they would have liked to have attended Night School or joined a
fishing or golf club but that shiftwork prevented them from doing
so. As a result, rather than become 'fully paid up' members of
clubs and societies they preferred to go to occasional meetings
because they knew that their job of work prevented them from
becoming regular attenders at these club meetings.

The firemen were better integrated into the local community
than the 'Affluent Workers'. Goldthorpe et al., gives figures
on the percentage of their sample who reported that they (as a

_____

(1) 52% of the 'Affluent Workers' did not belong to clubs or
    associations but this higher level of participation amongst
    'Affluent Workers' can be explained in part by the fact that
    some of the craftsmen in the sample did not work shifts.

couple) had no more than two regular spare-time companions.   The
figure they gave for the 'Affluent Workers' was 50% whereas it was
only 17% for the firemen.   In addition the average number of spare-
time associates for the 'Affluent Workers' who were not members of
the household was 2.38 associates per worker.   The same figure
for the firemen was 4.6 associates per worker.

The Extra Job or 'Fiddle'.

Many of the firemen worked extra jobs or a 'fiddle'.
Many of them, whose children had grown up, and whose wives worked,
did not have the same motivation to stay in the home and were
therefore more likely to take part time work outside the home.
To argue this case I have divided the sample of married firemen
with children into four separate groups according to whether or
not they worked a 'fiddle' and according to whether or not their
wives worked.   The results of this break-down are given in
Table 5. 3 in terms of the following groups:-

Group 1.   Firemen with an extra job whose wives work full
            or part-time.

Group 2.   Firemen with an extra job whose wives are not
            working full or part-time.

Group 3.   Firemen who do not have an extra job and whose
            wives work either full or part-time.

Group 4.   Firemen who do not have an extra job and whose
            wives do not work either full or part-time.

TABLE 5. 3

TABLE TO REPRESENT THE IMPORTANCE OF AGE AND WHETHER OR NOT WIVES WORK
AS FACTORS OF RELEVANCE FOR FIREMEN WORKING EXTRA JOBS.

	1	2	3	4
TOTAL IN GROUP	15	9*	12	6
TOTAL IN GROUP WITH CHILDREN	13	7	7	6
MEAN AGE OF MEN WITH CHILDREN	36	31	33	33
RANGE OF AGE OF MEN WITH CHILDREN	27-46	22-37	26-53	26-46
MEAN AGE OF CHILDREN	10	4	9	5
RANGE OF AGE OF CHILDREN	$1\frac{1}{2}$-21	2-6	2-25	2-14

* One respondent in this group of 9 would not reveal his age.

The difference between the outer groups 1 and 4 is three years. The difference between groups 1 and 3 is less than the difference between groups 1 and 2 which suggests that the more significant factor of the two variables here is whether the wife decided to go out to work or not.

From this table we can see that as the children become older more wives took a full or part-time job. It is not too obvious why the husbands could not have taken an 'extra job' when younger, in the sense that this would have been compatible with the dominant presented sex roles of the husband as 'provider' and the wife as 'mother' of the family. One explanation is that the firemen would have taken an extra job but for the exigencies of the family situation.

It is not surprising that the firemen adopted this pattern of behaviour when one analyses their primary orientation to life. The respondents were asked the question: "The most important things I do are connected with work, leisure or the family? A majority of the firemen chose the family alternative in preference to the work and leisure alternatives.

With this orientation it is easy to see, when their children and wives were at home, why the husbands did not take on an 'extra job' or 'fiddle'. As the children became older the wives were less 'tied to the home' and were able to take a part-time job. With his children at school and the wife doing a part-time or full-time job the older firemen were more free to pursue extra work without family constraints or conflict with their strong sense of home-centredness.

The motivation to perform a second job amongst the older firemen might well be explicable in terms of the point in the life

cycle at which it was performed as well as in terms of the kinds
of general relationships which typified life at home during the
day.   The shift system the firemen worked meant that they were
at home for the best part of the normal working day on at least
four occasions a week.   This time was 'normal working time' for
a high proportion of the firemen's friendships who worked outside
the Fire Service.   It is hereby argued that the respondents
choice of social relationships was curtailed by the fact that
many of the friends they would otherwise have seen were at work.[1]

There was no need for the firemen with young children with
wives at home to get an extra job.   The financial rewards from
extra work were in most cases quite low.   These men found
relationships within the family rewarding and did not venture
outside the family for companionship.   It was more often the older
firemen with wives at work and children at school who worked a
'fiddle'.   There was/a thus tendency for the firemen who did not get
an extra job, who did not have working wives, to be slightly
younger in age.   Staying with the family offered the younger
firemen a more suitable arrangement than working an extra job.

With regard to their wives' attitude to extra work, I
asked the firemen the question: "Does your wife ever say whether
she prefers you to stay at home?"   Nearly all the men said that
their wives preferred them to stay at home.   However, the firemen
would be unlikely to say that their wives preferred them out of
the home.   Although most of the firemen's wives preferred them at
home a high proportion of the firemen worked an extra job for
'economic' reasons.

The firemen who carried out paid extra work stressed the
fact that they were not tied down by it or at least did not like

_____

(1)   Not many of the firemen's friends would work the same
       shift times as the firemen.

to be.   They also stated that such work operated often on an
informal almost discontinuous basis.   There was in fact a measure
of autonomy regarding when, where, and whether they decided to do
their extra job or not.   The men did not have to work the extra
job if they did not feel like it.   If one man did not want to work
the job on a particular day he would ask another man to stand in
for him.   This was especially true of the men living on the square.
(These men were living and working much closer together than the
ones who lived at a distance from the station and were better able
to make these arrangements).

It must be noted that the extra jobs were not especially
well paid.   In many cases, especially where the job was operated
on a discontinuous ad hoc basis, it may well be that these jobs
were only worked insofar as they did not injure the social
relationships, i.e. family relations of the firemen.

As has been shown, in many cases the extra job was worked
while the rest of the family was away;   either the wife was at
work or the children were at school.   Secondly, I have noted the
characteristics of the extra job were informal, often discontinuous
and varied.   Thirdly, I have evidence to show that the extra jobs
seemed to have relatively little effect on certain kinds of family
interaction.   With this last point in mind the following material
is relevant.   The respondents were asked:-   "We have been talking
about your friends and your spare-time activities - how about having
other couples round, say, for a meal or just for the evening;   how
often would you do this on average?"   In fact 52% of those who
worked extra jobs entertain in this way once a month or more, 55%
of those who did not work an extra job entertained once a month or
more.   The difference does not seem to be very great and it is
suggested that the extra jobs do not greatly affect this kind of

sociability.   This reinforces the conclusion that the extra jobs
are in some sense peripheral.

The respondents were also asked whether they would work
regular overtime at the station.   Most of the men said that they
did not mind doing an extra tour of duty every so often but would
not like to do it continuously.   In fact, regular overtime of
this kind was not available and what overtime was available was
worked out on a rota basis.   But the men did not like the thought
of regular overtime even if it was available.   The snag for them
would be that once they had opted for it they would feel that
they had to do it.   This compares with the extra jobs which
gave the firemen the freedom that they liked.

Living on the Square.

About 25% of the sample 'lived on the square' around the
Fire Station.   There were thirty houses on the station.   The
houses were terraced and located around the edge of the drill
square, and were used for both officers and men.

The main advantage of living on the square was that rents
were low.   In addition, there were savings in transport costs.
But there seemed to be some disadvantages as well:-

Firstly, there was the feeling that one could not get away
from work.   One man said: "You could walk out on the square in
the morning and you see the lads on drill. It's all work, you see
it all the time - I mean I like the job but I am not that fond of
it that I want to be on it twentyfour hours a day, seven days a
week. People live on the square for convenience.   They get used
to rolling out of the front door and into work.   The wives get
used to knocking on one another's doors and having coffee parties
on the square. It's a very close knit community."

Secondly, there was a feeling of lack of privacy on the square; "When you live here everybody sees you coming in and out, and they see what you are doing twentyfour hours a day. To me, it's the Fire Brigade twentyfour hours a day, even though a bt of them say when they close the front door it's like staying in their own home." They were never completely away from the world of work, "their back garden was the square".

Some firemen 'on the square' felt that the job spilled over onto leisure: "Some people come by and say 'A piece of equipment is missing, can you tell me where it is?'. If you live away it's marvellous. Perhaps you've got your own little garden and a workman and a milkman living on either side."

For these firemen the work extended into leisure to a greater degree than was the case for the firemen who lived in their own homes away from the station: "Everyone can see what everyone else is doing" was a common enough sentiment. Even in their own homes on the square the firemen could hear what was happening on the square.

Many firemen expressed the view that the houses were believed to be good for young couples setting up a home since they were in an ideal position to save up for a house and move out later if they wanted to. Some of the firemen moved from the square when they had children. One respondent told me: "It's mainly the children they fall out about. There's not much for the children to do. They can't play in the square because the cars are there. They have arguments about whose been scratching the cars and all the rest of it. But it soon all goes by the board and youre one big happy family."

One man who recently moved said: "It's a good place for saving up. We'd been saving up and we'd decided to buy this house, but since I've moved off I've found I've not been getting fed up

with myself.   I've not been getting moody whereas before I'd come
off work and go across to the house and you'd see your front door
and there's be a fire engine.   You'd have friends coming and the
bells would be going and things like that.   It's not like that
where I am now, where I go home and take my uniform off and that's
me finished till the next morning.

One consequence of living on the square was that the
wives came to know more about the job than those wives living away.
They also formed friendship groups of two or three.   As one fireman
put it, "The knock about in groups of two or three, but if there's
a party you'll get them all in one house."   Babysitting was no
problem for people on the square, and the couples had greater
freedom to go out at night than those who lived away.

There was no feeling, however, that the men on the square
were closer to each other than the rest of the firemen in my sample.
As one respondent put it, "If you don't make friends with people
while your working with them for fiftysix hours a week, you're
not going to make friends when you're living with them as well.
I'd say it's the job that gives you the opportunity to make
friends and it's no disadvantage to move from the square."   Another
said, "It's not very nice - it's a closed community;   I'd sooner
be away."   Others emphasized the help that was available from
friends on the square:

"It's a little community on its own - if you come unstuck
they'll help you."

Others seemed to think it was the same as living elsewhere:

"People don't go in and out of each other's houses now.
They used to in the old days. Now it's the same as living elsewhere.
At the moment we can't afford to move."

For those living on the square the Fire Service must have
seemed more total and pervasive in nature.   In general this

pervasiveness was not liked and a fairly large number of the

firemen I spoke to had moved away from the square and bought their

own house.   Also the 'pervasiveness' of 'square' life did not

apply to patterns of sociability.   Firemen who lived on the

square had just as many friends outside the Fire Service as firemen

who did not live on it.   The 'square' was characterized by the

unwelcome encroachment of work on leisure life.

The Level of Sociability with Workmates.

The firemen in my sample had a lower percentage of friend-

ships inside the service than, for example, did Banton's sample

of policemen.[1]   66% of Banton's sample of city police had more

than three friends in the force.   Policemen, however, are subject to

a body of disciplinary rules which govern aspects of their non-work

behaviour and the nature of police work means that policemen and

the public are likely to be wary of the possible implications of

friendship or associational relationships.[2]

Salaman has argued that it is probably more fruitful to

consider the concept 'occupational community' in terms of degree

rather than in terms of its presence or absence.   This application

of the term is well suited to the Fire Service, which has a number

of intermediate characteristics.   From Table 5. 4 it can be seen

that 20% of the sample as a whole had most of their friends in the

Fire Service and 4 - 6 of their closest friends in the Fire Service.

Nevertheless 24% had most of their friends outside the Fire Service

and more of their closest friends in the Fire Service.

(1)   M. Banton, 'The Policeman in the Community', London,
       Tavistock Publications, page 248-9.

(2)   J. Young, 'The Role of the Police as Amplifiers of Deviancy'
       Cohen,   Images of Deviancy, Harmondsworth, Penguin, p.27-61.

TABLE 5. 4

FRIENDSHIP PATTERNS OF THE CITY FIREMEN[*]

	MOST IN FIRE SERVICE %	MOST OUTSIDE FIRE SERVICE %	HALF AND HALF %	TOTAL %
4 - 6 CLOSEST FRIENDS IN THE FIRE SERVICE	20	0	5	25
1 - 3 CLOSEST FRIENDS IN THE FIRE SERVICE	15	15	5	35
NONE OF CLOSEST FRIENDS IN FIRE SERVICE	8	23	8	40
TOTAL	43	39	18	100

[*]   The M. Thomas Survey op. cit., page 39 states that 40% of the junior ranks had most of their friends outside the Fire Service.   35% had most of their friends in the Fire Service, and 24% half and half.

TABLE 5. 5

FRIENDSHIP PATTERNS OF CITY FIREMEN IN FIRE SERVICE
ACCOMMODATION [*]

	MOST IN FIRE SERVICE %	MOST OUTSIDE FIRE SERVICE %	HALF AND HALF %	TOTAL %
4 - 6 CLOSEST FRIENDS IN FIRE SERVICE	23	0	0	23
1 - 3 CLOSEST FRIENDS IN FIRE SERVICE	22	44	0	66
NONE OF CLOSEST FRIENDS IN FIRE SERVICE	0	11	0	11
TOTAL	45	55	0	100

[*]   'On the square'.

TABLE 5. 6

FRIENDSHIP PATTERNS OF CITY FIREMAN IN NON FIRE SERVICE
ACCOMMODATION

	MOST IN FIRE SERVICE %	MOST OUTSIDE FIRE SERVICE %	HALF AND HALF %	TOTAL %
4 - 6 CLOSEST FRIENDS IN FIRE SERVICE	20	0	6.5	26.5
1 - 3 CLOSEST FRIENDS IN FIRE SERVICE	13	7	6.5	26.5
NONE OF CLOSEST FRIENDS IN FIRE SERVICE	10	27	10	46
TOTAL	43	34	23	100

In the sample as a whole these two groups occupied the largest percentages. There was the 'occupation' oriented group who had most of their friends in the service, and the 'outward' oriented group who had most of their friends outside the service. One interesting fact is that it was the 'occupation' oriented group which had the highest proportion of extra jobs. This reflected the way in which the extra jobs were based on an informal network. The firemen did not like to feel compelled to work a 'fiddle' if it did not 'fit in'. If extra work did not 'fit in' they would ask their mates to do it. This was relatively easy for the firemen who lived on the square, and was an accepted part of square life.

Of the group who had most of their friends in the Fire Service / and 4-6 closest friends in the Fire Service only 25% saw

mates from the station more than once a week during non-work time, 25% saw them less than once a week and 50% not at all.   This group had more friends in the Fire Service than any other and this relatively low level of after work association suggests that work itself provided enough opportunity to make and interact with real friends.   Some firemen told me that if they could not make friends with their companions in the fiftysix hours they worked with them then they were not likely to do it after work.

Of the group who had none of their closest friends in the Fire Service / and most of their friends outside the Fire Service 78% did not see mates after work and 22% saw them only occasionally.

The distance that they lived away from the station, though important, did not determine the pattern of afterwork sociability. Very often the firemen that saw their mates after work lived further away from the station than those who did not.

A relatively high percentage of the sample (36%) saw friends from other fire stations after work however;   firemen who had moved in from other stations like to keep in contact with the friends they had made.   Firemen who were active in sporting, social, or union activities tended to see more of firemen from other stations.

50% of those who lived on the square manifested an 'above average' level of sociability with their work mates.   This did not mean, however, that most of their friends were in the Fire Service.   Table 5. 5 shows that most firemen 'on the square' had most of their friends in occupations outside the Fire Service. The extension of work into leisure on the square was unwelcome.[1]

_____

(1)   The 'extension' of work into leisure on the square was not liked. The firemen could not get away from work despite the fact they were 'not on duty'.

Unlike policemen who, in a sense, never go off duty, the sample

of firemen as a whole showed a desire to be 'off duty' at the end

of the day.   All of them said that when work finished, they

wanted to 'get off' home.   Work was seen ideally as being completely

different from leisure.   The fireman's central life interest was

his family (for 74% of the firemen - Table 5. 11).   The wearing

of uniform at home in leisure hours was thought of as somewhat

unnecessary and jokes were made about it.[2]

Despite the lack of an actual 'need' for the extension of

work into leisure the firemen appeared to associate more with

each other after work than did the 'Affluent Workers'.   The most

popular form of after work association for the firemen was going

to pubs and clubs with mates.   Whereas only 11% of the 'Affluent

Worker' sample associated in this way, 30% of the firemen did so.

(see Table 5. 7)

In addition, 15% of the firemen had close friends at work

whom they did not meet after work.   Interaction at work itself

was sufficient to sustain the friendship.   If a fireman could

not make friends with his mates when at work it was said he never

would.   Work then provided a setting for maintaining relationships

which were not sustained after work.   In contrast, it was

technology itself which prevented the 'Affluent Workers' from

becoming friends when at work.   In the fire station the technology

was associated with the emergencies which united the working group.

The firemen, working as a team, 'extended' themselves when using

the technology in an emergency situation.

However, the lack of real emergency situations in the

fireman's leisure hours meant that there was little to bind the

----

(2)   I was told that some firemen wore their uniforms after
       work so that their neighbours thought they were policemen.
       This was ridiculed.

TABLE 5. 7

LEVEL OF ASSOCIATION WITH FRIENDS AFTER WORK(IN THE
CASE OF FIREMEN) AND WITH WORKMATES REGARDED AS CLOSE
FRIENDS.   (IN THE CASE OF THE 'AFFLUENT WORKERS'). [*]

TYPE OF ASSOCIATION	FIREMEN %	ASSEMBLERS[*] %	ALL 'AFFLUENT WORKERS'[*] %
VISITING AT HOME	22	19	16
ARRANGED OUTINGS	3	5	11
SEMI-CASUAL MEETINGS - PUBS, ETC.	30	14	11
PURELY CASUAL	5	26	17
NO CLOSE FRIENDS AND NO MEETING	25	36	45
NO MEETING WITH CLOSE FRIENDS	15	0	0

[*]   J. Goldthorpe et al., op. cit., Vol. 1, page 57.

firemen together after work.   Moreover, many of them had left

the forces'way of life because the overriding pervasiveness of that

organizational form left little room for the development of the

kind of family life that they wanted.   The separation of work

and leisure and the lower level of pervasiveness of the organization

into family life appealed to the firemen.   But they did not reject

the possibility of extension.   They argued that when a REAL

emergency came and they were required to stay on and help, they

would be prepared to do so.   Under normal circumstances, however,

one shift of firemen was all that was needed and it was not often

that they were required to stay after hours.

It would perhaps be justifiable to assume that firemen would

participate more intensively in work-based clubs after work than the

'Affluent Workers', for the following reasons: First, sport was

encouraged during work time and the relationships created at work

could be used to continue the activity after work time.   Secondly,

the men had more time at work to see each other and arrange the

events.   Thirdly, a proportion of the sample lived on the square

and for them it would be relatively easy to arrange activities

after work.

In the light of these facts the revelation that the level

of participation in clubs and associations after work was the same

as in the 'Affluent Worker' sample is rather surprising.[1]   20% of

the firemen attended clubs and societies regularly and 25%

occasionally.   The figures for the 'Affluent Workers' are 25% and

29% respectively.   It may be the case, however, that the opportunities

-----

(1) Many respondents mentioned the fact that they expected clubs and
     societies to be more significant in their lives are the reorgan-
     ization. The men at the smaller of the two stations I visited
     were restricted in what they could dc. because there was six men
     on their shift.   They also mentioned that participation would
     be easier in a large organization where it would be possible to
     obtain adequate numbers for teams to be formed.

available in work during standby to participate in clubs and
sports, etc. make after-work associations relatively unnecessary.

All the men men were members of the Fire Brigades Union.
The firemen were sometimes able to attend union meetings during
standdown time while at work.   Fortyfive per cent of the men
attended union meetings regularly and 28% occasionally.   These figures
are much higher than the level of participation in the 'Affluent
Worker' sample.   Only 4% of the Assemblers in the 'Affluent Worker'
sample attended union meetings regularly and only 10% attended
occasionally.   For the 'Affluent Worker' sample as a whole the
figures are 7% and 14% respectively.

This relatively high level of union participation is
accompanied by what the firemen call an 'apathetic attitude' to
the Union.   As one fireman said: "I am not a great one for unions".
"I am not a strong union bloke" another fireman remarked.
"Unions are not really important"   and   "I never make a point of
attending - I only go when I'm on nights and I happen to be there".
And   "I have never been a strong trade unionist" and again   "The
Trade Union in this job is weak, you've got no ultimate deterrent
like striking.   Most of the men won't strike anyway"   and
"If there is something of interest I'll go, otherwise I don't
attend, I'm not a strong union bloke".

The explanation for this state of affairs (high participation
but low involvement) was that it was easy for the firemen to attend
the meetings.   The larger station was a trade union branch and
the firemen could attend if their shift coincided with a Union meeting.

<u>Work and Non-Work.</u>

Parker develops the perspective "that there are occupational differences within class and status groupings which play a large part in determining the style of leisure, family behaviour, political orientations as well as more general values". [1]

Parker argues that there are three basic work non-work relationships:

"Briefly the extension pattern consists of having leisure activities which are often similar in content to one's working activities and of making no sharp distinction between what is considered as work and what is considered as leisure. With the opposition pattern leisure activities are deliberately unlike work and there is a sharp distinction between what is considered work and what is leisure. Finally, the neutrality pattern consists of having leisure activities which are generally different from work but no deliberately so, and of appreciating the difference between work and leisure without always defining the one as the absence of the other". [2]

Parker carried out a study of three occupational groups. [3] These groups included bankers, youth employment and child care officers. Parker argues that the youth employment and the child care officers tended to have a way of relating work to leisure conforming to an 'extension' pattern. Their leisure activities were often similar in content to their working activities and they made no sharp demarcation between work and leisure; they were

----

(1)   S. Parker, 'Work and Non Work in Three Occupations'
      Sociological Review, Vol. 13, No.1, page 65.

(2)   S. Parker, 'The Future of Work and Leisure', London,
      Paladin, 1972, page 101-2.

(3)   S. Parker, op. cit.,

work involved and the main function of leisure for them was to develop their personality.   By contrast Parker argues that miners and fishermen[1] have been shown to have an 'opposition' pattern. Their way of spending leisure contrasted with the way they worked. They sharply distinguished work and leisure and their work was performed chiefly to earn a living.   Leisure functioned for them as compensation for dangerous and damaging work.

Parker found that the bank employees were neither so engrossed in their work that they wanted to carry it over into their spare time, nor so damaged by it that they became hostile or developed a love-hate relationship to it.[2]   The bankers had 'neutral' work-leisure relationships.

I decided to reproduce Parker's original questionnaire and assess its applicability to the city firemen I interviewed.   The objective was to evaluate these concepts in relation to the occupational role of firemen.

The questions which provided the data in Table 5. 8 were:-

1. Out of all the abilities you possess how many do you use in your present job?

2. To what extent do you normally use the above abilities in your job?

3. When changes have to be made or difficult problems solved which (of the following) would apply in your job?

4. By what means do you think people get ahead in your kind of work?

5. If you could choose any occupation regardless of money would you ......   ?

The first and second questions were intended to find out the extent to which the firemen felt extended in their job.

_____

(1)   J.Tunstall, "The Fishermen: The Sociology of an Extreme Occupation", London, MacGibbon and Kee, 1969.

(2)   Op. cit., page 74.

Firemen felt that they used most of their abilities in a general way. The third question called for an objective assessment of the way decisions were made. "Superior would decide without consultation with men" was the most usual way decisions were made. However, some of the firemen thought that authority relations on the station and on the 'fire ground' were rather different. On the 'fireground' they believed that there was much more scope for the making of their own decisions. It could be claimed, however, that this relative autonomy on the fireground was a characteristic of the particular brigade from which the sample was drawn. The respondents, in fact, critized other brigades who were more bureaucratic in their organization.

The fourth question measured the firemen's perception of what constituted successful behaviour in the occupation. Being approved of by the right persons was relatively less important to success than working and studying hard. The firemen mentioned that if this were true before the reorganization it was likely to be even more true after it, since they expected that 'personal relations' as a factor in deciding promotion would diminish in importance as the big Reorganized Brigade took over and assimiláted the smaller County Borough Brigade. In the pre-reorganization situation the passing of exams had been no guarantee of promotion. In the reorganized brigade the firemen felt there would be fewer cases of firemen not receiving the promotion appropriate to the level of examination pass. It was believed that promotion would be more impartial in the new organization.

The answer to the fifth question gave an indication of the degree of commitment to the job of being a fireman. This commitment was high. Only 9% of my sample said that they wanted

to do something different.[1]   The firemen were also asked the

question "During the last week how many hours of leisure have

you spent: With your family, with work colleagues, with

other friends and by yourself?".

Questions of this type rely very much on the occurring

of the respondents' memories.   It is possible to argue that

memories are more accurate when only short amounts of time are

involved.   This, in part, explains the large variation in the

standard deviation scores in Table 5.9.   The number of hours

spent with the family was on average much greater;   the range

of variation and the standard deviation were also greater,

reflecting the important differences which exist between individuals,

and the greater difficulty involved in estimating the more 'pervasive'

types of activity.

Table 5. 10 compares my sample with the three occupations

studied by Parker.   Married firemen spent more time by themselves

than any of the other groups. They also had a higher total of

leisure hours.

---

(1)   This was similar to the percentage that Parker found for
       child care workers.   The important difference between
       firemen and social workers is that the latter's work-
       leisure relationships are of the 'extension' type.

TABLE 5. 8

FACTORS IN THE FIREMAN'S WORK EXPERIENCE AND VALUES

		%	No.
A.	**NUMBER OF ABILITIES FELT TO BE USED IN PRESENT JOB**		
	MOST	53	23
	SOME	35	15
	ONLY A FEW	12	5
		100	
B.	**EXTENT TO WHICH ABILITIES FELT TO BE USED IN PRESENT JOB**		
	IN A SUPERFICIAL WAY	7	3
	IN A GENERAL WAY	75	33
	IN QUITE AN INTENSIVE WAY	18	8
		100	
C.	**PERCEIVED METHOD OF DEALING WITH CHANGES OR DIFFICULT PROBLEMS**		
	1. SUPERIOR WOULD DECIDE WITHOUT CONSULTATION WITH STAFF	58	25
	2. SUPERIOR WOULD DECIDE AFTER CONSULTATION WITH STAFF	18	8
	3. DECISION TAKEN AT MEETING OF ALL INVOLVED	14	6
	4. OWN DECISION	5	2
	5. SUPERIOR DECIDES WITHOUT CONSULTATION AND OWN DECISION	5	2
		100	
D.	**WAYS IN WHICH PEOPLE ARE THOUGHT TO GET AHEAD IN THIS KIND OF WORK**		
	1. WORKING AND STUDYING HARD	52	23
	2. BEING APPROVED OF BY THE RIGHT PEOPLE	34	15
	3. SENIORITY	2	1
	4. OTHER ANSWERS	0	0
	5. WORKING AND STUDYING HARD BEING APPROVED OF BY THE RIGHT PEOPLE	12	5
		100	
E.	**JOB CHOICE REGARDLESS OF MONEY**		
	SAME	81	37
	SIMILAR	7	3
	DIFFERENT	9	4
		100	

TABLE 5. 9

TABLE TO SHOW WITH WHOM LEISURE TIME IS SPENT PER WEEK

	WITH FAMILY (N = 34)	WORK COLLEAGUES (N = 30)	OTHER FRIENDS (N = 27)	BY ONESELF (N = 30)
AVERAGE TIME SPENT (ARITHMETICAL MEAN)	31	3	6	11
RANGE OF VARIATION	15-90	0-20	0-10	0-40
STANDARD DEVIATION FROM THE MEAN	20	3.9	2.5	9.3

Another set of questions was concerned with the relative importance of work and none work spheres in the respondents lives. The concern here was with the importance of work versus non work values.

The questions which provided the data were:-

1.   Do you enjoy leisure because ....?

    (a) It satisfies interests you would like to satisfy in work.

    (b) It is satisfying in a different way to work.

    (c) It is completely different to work.

2.   How different is your leisure from your work?

    (a) Completely different.

    (b) A lot of leisure time taken up by things connected with work.

    (c) A little free time is taken up by things connected with work.

3.   The most important things I do are connected with ...↲?

    (a) Work

    (b) Leisure

    (c) The family

The data from these questions are presented in Table 5.11. Most firemen enjoyed leisure because it was completely different from work. The fireman's central life interest was the family.

Despite a high level of involvement with emergency situations the firemen put family before work in most cases. I have already argued that the firemen had an expressive orientation to work. It is evidence such as this which emphasizes the need for care of the orientation to work concept. The finding that the fireman's central life interest was in the family indicates the importance of the fireman's 'expressive' orientation to work.

TABLE 5. 10

LEISURE HOURS PER WEEK SPENT

	BANKING*		YOUTH EMPLOYMENT*		CHILD CARE*		FIREMEN	
	SINGLE	MARRIED	SINGLE	MARRIED	SINGLE	MARRIED	SINGLE	MARRIED
WITH FAMILY	20	34	12	26	10	23	28	32
WITH WORK COLLEAGUES	3	2	1	1	3	3	1	3
WITH OTHER FRIENDS	15	3	11	3	12	4	17	5
BY ONESELF	15	2	10	3	10	4	4	10
TOTAL	43	41	34	33	35	34	50	50
N	58	44	48	64	44	36	7	34

* S. Parker, ibid, page 69.

TABLE 5. 11

FACTORS REFLECTING WORK VERSUS LEISURE VALUES

	%	No.
ENJOY LEISURE BECAUSE		
1. SATISFIES INTERESTS THAT WOULD LIKE TO SATISFY IN WORK	0	0
2. IS SATISFYING IN A DIFFERENT WAY FROM WORK	42	18
3. BECAUSE IT IS COMPLETELY DIFFERENT FROM WORK	58	25
	100	
HOW DIFFERENT LEISURE IS FROM WORK		
1. COMPLETELY DIFFERENT	78	34
2. A LOT OF FREE TIME TAKEN UP BY THINGS CONNECTED WITH WORK	4	2
3. A LITTLE FREE TIME TAKEN UP BY THINGS CONNECTED WITH WORK	18	8
	100	
CENTRAL LIFE INTEREST		
WORK	10	4
FAMILY	74	29
LEISURE	16	6
	100	

Use of Leisure Time - Four Examples.

FIREMAN A.

This fireman was 46.   His family have been based in the City for many years.   He has a child aged 14.   He had worked in the Fire Service for 16 years.   His wife normally worked but was off work at the time of the interview because she was ill.   He told me that he had stopped doing an 'extra job' six years ago as he did not enjoy doing it - he just needed the money.   His mother lived in the City and he saw her every week.   The other relatives he saw less frequently.   He helped his wife with the washing up, the shopping (his main responsibility) and the children.   The people he saw most often outside the family were neighbours and relatives.

1st day off.

He had a puncture and so he took the car to the garage. After this he went to the shopping precinct with his wife.   He called on his mother and had a cup of tea and watched television. Then his wife's cousin came over for tea.   Later he went to the pub with his wife's cousin.

2nd day off.

He took his wife to the washetaria, and did the washing. Then he worked for a while on his car. After that he did some gardening and went window shopping.

This fireman mentioned that he did much the same kind of activities during the day before comong on 'nights'.   "The first day on nights never bothers me. On the second day I usually have an hour on the couch depending on what kind of night it is."

FIREMAN B.

This man was 41. His closest relative outside his immediate family was his father, whom he saw once a month. He had several children (with an average age of 13). He had worked in the Fire Service for seventeen years. His wife worked part-time. He worked an extra job - 'undertaking' for a few hours each week. "It's a good thing to have the extra money". Many of his own relatives were either dead or dispersed and therefore he saw more of his wife's relations. He saw his wife's father 2-3 times a week. "If we have tea together the girls wash up with the wife. If the wife takes them to school I wash up. I wash up my own things if I've been on days". On Thursdays and Saturdays he took the wife shopping in the van, but normally his wife went out shopping every day. He helped with the children, but "they prefer the mother to put them to bed". The people he saw most often were 'outsiders' - he met many of them in the pub; they lived locally.

1st day off - a Friday.

First of all he 'did two funerals' and picked up bodies from two different houses, and then went for a pint at the local. He had tea in the evening and watched television until bedtime.

2nd day off - a Saturday.

He took his wife to the shopping centre, and went to the social club in the evening to meet his friends. His wife did not drink.

This respondent mentioned that he did not do 'funerals' on the days when he worked nights. He spent his time doing odd jobs around the house. If his wife was working while he was 'off' he got the tea ready.

FIREMAN C.

This respondent was 38, and had two children aged eleven and thirteen. He had worked in the Fire Service for seventeen years. His wife worked part-time. He worked an extra job but he said this had no effect on family life because "the kids are at school and I can please myself when I go in". His father lived with the family and his grandparents lived in the city. He saw his brother once a week. He did not see so much of his wife's family though they lived locally. He did not wash up - his wife and father did that. His wife did the main shopping. He helped with the children. His relations lived locally. The people he saw most were his neighbours as his main hobby was gardening.

1st day off.

He went into the garden and did some gardening. Then he went out to the baths. He then played with the children, watched T.V. and went to bed.

2nd day off.

He went into the town, did some shopping and spent the rest of the day gardening.

He mentioned that on the days before coming on nights he would not do anything which would interfere with the night duty, e.g. heavy work. He spent his time having breakfast, working in the greenhouse and in preparation for coming to work.

FIREMAN D.

This respondent was aged 35 years. He had two children aged
eight and thirteen. He had worked nine and a half years in the
Fire Service. His wife worked part-time. He worked part-time
on an ad hoc basis. "If anybody comes up with a job, well, it's
a few bob extra. It helps out a lot. If someone wants a van
taking here or some lifting done I say 'O.K.' and I'll spend a
couple of days with them but normally I don't because I can find
quite a bit to do at home these days, you know. I do it for the
money to help out." His relatives lived mostly in the city.
He saw his father twice a week. He had an uncle in South Africa.
His wife's relatives were spread out, "I see her brothers and
sisters around the city. The ones in Leeds usually come to see
us when they visit her mother. I see them 5-6 times a year.
We spend Christmas as a family". He helped with the washing
up, the main shopping and with the children. The people he saw
most often outside his immediate family were his father, his
sister-in-law, his brother-in-law and father-in-law.

1st day off.

It was market day and he went shopping. He then did his
mother-in-law's shopping. He spent the evening at home watching
television.

2nd day off.

He worked in the house. He invited his father down and spent
the evening in. On the other days he sometimes does nothing, or
sees a mate or takes a walk in the park.

During the day before coming on nights this respondent helped
his wife clean up round the house. In the afternoons he started
to get things ready for work - he pressed his own trousers, cleaned
his own shoes and cap. etc. Sometimes on days off he went for

walks in the park. On other occasions he would "pop round" and
see a mate "if he's off duty".

The most 'popular' activities amongst the sample in general
on the two days 'off' appeared to be: gardening, shopping,
working on the house, visiting relatives, working on the extra job.
In answer to the question: "How many hours of leisure do you
normally have per week",32% answered 10-20 hours, 44% answered
20-30 hours and 24% answered 30-40 hours. Despite the actual
differences in their estimations of the time available to them
the actual type of activity during the two days off appeared much
the same throughout the sample. It is interesting to compare
those with 10-20 hours with those who had 30-40 hours. The main
difference is that those with fewer leisure hours tended to work
extra jobs. The '10-20' group said:

"I spent three hours on an old dear's garden up to dinner -
the time when the wife finishes. I went home and got dinner
ready. I got the car out and went shopping in the afternoon.
Next day I was cleaning windows and shopping in the afternoon.

"First day I was working. Second day went to the Town Hall
- to the income tax place to see about relief. Then I went out
with one of the lads on B watch for a few pints, had a wash, shave -

"Worked."

"Decorating at home."

"Messing about doing odd jobs."

"Worked on job both days and took the wife out for a drink
in the evening."

"I went shopping with the wife and did a bit of gardening
and decorating on the car, and went out with mates from the same
watch" and "I did some jobs round the house. I looked after
the kiddy while the wife went shopping. Then went shopping myself.

and   "I had two punctures and I took the car to the garage.
I went to the shopping precinct with the wife. We called at the
mother-in-law's and had a cup of tea and watched a bit of telly and
then went back to the pub with the wife's cousins. Next day I
took the wife to the washeteria. Did the washing up. Messed with
the car."

and   "Thirty per cent time is spent with union work. I spend an
amount of time watching football and I do all the shopping for the
family."

Those who had 30-40 hours said:

"I take the wife shopping. I potter round the home, and
do little jobs on the car."

and   "I go shopping - I go to the local parks, etc."

and again   "Majority of time spent in the garden normally".

and   "I go to play school. Get changed and have breakfast.
I play with my son. I go to play school and collect daughter; go
down to the meadow or park. I go out again and visit wife's
mother and go shopping and then watch T.V."

and   "I went to the bank. Then I pottered about in the garden.
I picked up the wife from work and then took her back. I went to
the dog show - its my hobby; I gave the dog a groom. I picked up
the wife. The second day I was building a patio in the back
garden, I put up some shelves in the garage. I checked the car
batteries and took the dog for a walk."

and   "Gardening, just gardening. I came out here for a dance
on Saturday night."

and again   "I went into town and paid a couple of bills at the
big stores. The two boys come home for meals, I made dinner for them.
I took the youngest to the grandmother's ."

and   "Working in the house - visiting relatives. The majority of

time in the garden usually."

These activities, gardening, working extra jobs, shopping, looking after the 'kids', were essentially unlike work itself. There was little evidence of the firemen trying to find 'exciting' or 'dangerous' leisure activities. Presumably these needs were satisfied in work.

There are, however, a number of difficulties in applying Parker's concepts to work situations. There is the problem that the fireman's work role was split up into different activities which were qualitatively unlike each other. Routine station activities, drills, and maintenance tasks take up most of the time, but it was the 4% or so of time spent on operational work which generated the highest levels of involvement.

However, it can be argued that the routine activities in work (which included "leisurable" activities such as watching television, playing games and drinking in the bar) were qualitatively similar to acvitities normally considered after work as 'leisure' activities. Is the extension concept applicable here? It is not very helpful here because the firemen defined 'routine' leisurable activities as very unimportant in relation to the emergencies.

There are other difficulties in applying Parker's concepts. For instance, it can be argued that firemen's 'routine' activities included many activities which would be highly regarded in the home context. The firemen's central life interest was in the family. Activities such as watching television were regarded as routine in the station but were highly valued at home.

Do Parker's concepts refer to the formal similarity or dissimilarity of actions or to the meaning and quality of these actions? If the concepts refer to quality of action then it can be argued that the car workers' work-leisure relationships are of

the 'extension' type.   A car worker is not able to mass produce

cars in his garage during leisure times.   Nevertheless his

'alienation' in work may be 'extended' into alienation in leisure

activities.   Wilensky has called this the 'spillover' leisure

hypothesis.[1]   An auto worker goes home quietly, collapses on

the couch, eats and drinks alone, belongs to nothing, reads nothing,

knows nothing, votes for no-one, hangs around the home and the

street, watches the 'late-late' show, lets the TV programmes shade

into one another and is too tired to lift himself off the couch

for the act of selection and too bored to switch the dials.

If the focus is on the formal actions of the auto worker

then the work-leisure relationship is of the 'opposition' type.

This is because the auto worker is not forced to keep up with

machines.   His home environment is untechnological.   It is unlike

work.

It can be argued that occupations characterized by intensive

high level technology will almost automatically generate an

opposition or neutral work-leisure relationship (on the formal

level at least) because of the impossibilities of carrying over

the skills of work into the home situation.   Firemen and automobile

workers are examples of workers who are not able to carry over

work into leisure because they lack the technological apparatus

at home.   The firemen I spoke to, however, unlike the automobile

workers studied by other sociologists, were highly involved with

their work.   The work offered the firemen important intrinsic

satisfactions.

Despite this high level of involvement with work the firemen

did not have the same facility as Parker's social workers to extend

their work into leisure.   In this respect they were in the same

----

(1) H. Wilensky, 'Work Careers and Social Integration',
     International Social Science Journal, Vol. 12, No.4, 1960.

position as the autombile workers.   It was impossible for them
to continue with work (except in unusual circumstances) once they
left the work situation.

In unusual circumstances the firemen would be called upon
to work in their leisure time.   Many firemen liked this situation
but others resented the 'open-ended' nature of such commitment
they were expected to give.   One fireman did not like the fact
that members of the public asked them to perform 'silly' tasks:

"The last thing a fireman is is a servant.   Some people
don't realise that a cat wants to climb up a tree because it is
a natural thing to do.   They want a 12 stone fireman to go where
a 3 lb. cat goes."

Parker's neutrality concept is ambiguous.   It refers to
the fact that work may be unlike leisure but not deliberately so.
Neutrality may also exist in cases where 'formal' extension is
impossible because of basic technological differences in the home
and work environments.   The neutrality concept does not take
account of these possible differences in the resources of the home.
and work environments.   Firemen CANNOT normally fight fires in
their home non work environment.   Technological differences impose
a neutral work-leisure relationship.   One may question whether
the neutrality concept is adequate in these circumstances.

Likewise the extension concept may be applied in 'determined'
or 'voluntaristic' circumstances.   Parker's social workers extended
work into leisure by choice - because the work was worthwhile.
By contrast, the firemen who lived 'on the square' had less choice
about the infringement of work on their non-work life style.
For these firemen work extended into leisure and there was little
that could be done about it.   Their environment was more 'total'
in nature than the social workers.   Whereas the social workers

approved of the extension of work into leisure, the firemen I
spoke to regarded the extension as a definite disadvantage.

It is my contention that there are certain occupations
where explanation of work-leisure patterns in terms of Parker's
typology is extremely difficult.   I have argued that technology
is an important variable which must be included in any typology
of work-leisure relationships.   Parker's typology is narrow in
that it does not take account of these technological variables.
Firemen who liked dealing with emergencies were not able to extend
work into leisure because of the relationship between the
technology at work and their home situation.   The only kind of
extension which did exist was not technological in nature.
Firemen who lived 'on the square' did not have full access to the
technology of the work situation.

= = = = = = = = = =

VI - <u>INTEGRATIVE EMERGENCIES AND THE SMALL GROUP</u>

The term emergency has quite a wide meaning in everyday language, referring to a sudden occurrence or situation demanding immediate action.   The word crisis has a similar meaning and is applicable to a "momentous" juncture in war, politics, economics, family life or individual identity, and other situations.

The variety of situations covered by the term crisis is well illustrated by Emile Durkheim in his book on suicide. [1]   He relate the incidence of crises to the suicide rate.   He argued that economi crises were associated with anomie and an increase in the suicide rate: [2]

"In the case of economic disasters, indeed, something like a declassification occurs which suddenly casts certain individuals into a lower state than their previous one.   Then they must reduce their requirements, restrain their needs, learn greater self control. All the advantages of social influence are lost so far as they are concerned; their moral education has to be recommenced, but society cannot adjust them instantaneously to this new life and teach them the self repression to which they are unaccustomed, so they are not adjusted to the condition forced on them, and the very prospect of it is intolerable; hence the suffering which detaches them from a reduced existence even before they have made a trial of it."

Durkheim argued that economic crises have an aggravating effect on the suicide rate.   However, he believed that wars and political crises increase the level of social integration and have the effect of reducing the suicide rate.

----

(1) Op. cit.,

(2) Ibid., Chap. 5.

"Great sound disturbances and great popular wars rouse the collective sentiments, stimulate partisan spirit and patriotism, political and national faith, alike, and concentrating activity towards a single end, at least temporarily cause a stronger integration of society." [1]

Varying types of crisis and disaster situations have been analized by writers such as Baker and Chapman [2]; Barton [3]; Killian [4]; and Wallace [5]. I do not propose to discuss crises situations generally, because although the term crisis and emergency can be applied to these other situations, the sociological meanings and explanations which can be applied to them are very different from the "qualities" of the emergency situations that firemen have to deal with. Crises, as Durkheim has shown, may have integrative or disintegrative effects and I, in this study, will deal with integrative emergencies occurring in the context of "the small group", and I will leave the analysis of "macro crises" and disasters, and disintegrative crises and disasters, to further research. I am not therefore attempting a complete sociological analysis of crisis situations because my frame of reference is limited by the context of the original research situation - the Fire Stations. Nevertheless emergencies are such a basic feature of the fireman's work role I feel it is necessary to investigate their character.

_____

(1) Ibid., page 208.

(2) G.W. Baker and D.W. Chapman, "Man and Society in Disaster", New York, Basic Books, 1962.

(3) A.H. Barton et al., "Social Organization under Stress: A Sociological Review of Disaster Studies", Washington, D.C., National Academy of Science, 1963.

(4) L. Killian, "The Significance of Multiple Group Membership in Disaster", American Journal of Sociology, LVII, 1952, pages 309-14.

(5) A.F. Wallace, "Human Behaviour in Extreme Situations", Washington, D.C., National Academy of Science, 1956.

In the fire stations a "crisis" or "emergency" definition
of the situation comes into being because these small units are
specialized and focus their attention on limited goals [1].   I argu
that a crisis definition of the situation comes into being only when
the organization is small and specialized and most members are
concerned with achieving similar goals.   The first part of this
chapter is therefore concerned with crisis definition of the
situation in relation to organizational size.   I will illustrate
my arguments by reference to 4 work situations:

1.   The City Brigade which was the object of the research.

2.   The larger County Brigade which "surrounded" the
small City Brigade.

3.   Blauner's Bay Chemical Workers. [2]

4.   Goldthorpe et al's Chemical Works at Laporte. [3]

I am therefore illustrating the importance of size and number of
organizational goals, with reference to a small fire brigade;
a large fire brigade; a small chemical works; and a large chemical
works.

The first is the City Brigade. As I have mentioned, at
the time of the interviews, this was a small organization. It
was about to be reorganized to become part of the larger County
Brigade, but this had not happened at the time of the interviews.
Because the reorganization was about to happen, the firemen were
busy assessing the merits of their small City Brigade and (their
definition of) the merits and demerits of the large County Brigade.

It is important to emphasize that when comparing the small
and large fire brigades I am referring exclusively to the City
firemen's subjective definitions of the situation.   I did not visit

---

(1)   Dealing with emergency situations.

(2)   Op. cit.,

(3)   Op. cit.,

the County Brigade and did not attempt to assess its "objective" features.

The firemen in the small City Brigade defined the "emergency" situations as requiring immediate attention. The emergency was real and also they had the freedom of action to act as though it was really real. I argue they had a crisis orientation to the situation. The existence of the crisis orientation can be empirically verified by reference to a number of specific features present in the organization. The next few pages will be devoted to an examination of these features.

In the City Brigade the ordinary firemen were allowed a fairly high degree of autonomy on the "fireground".[1] The firemen liked this "arrangement", because they could "get on with" the task of extinguishing fires, and in addition, they were able to use their own initiative, sometimes independently of other officers. The crisis situations gave the firemen an opportunity to act in "normally illegitimate" ways; they could "crash" the lights[2] - action that an ordinary member of the public would not normally consider to be legitimate action.

In addition, obstructions on the roadway were seen as "making the difference between life and death". If there was a "persons reported" the City firemen would feel the need for speed in action. In these circumstances they were not pleased to be kept waiting in difficult road conditions. The rules of the road were adapted in the context of the emergency so that time could be saved. The speed of the appliances was not governed, and once they arrived they "got stuck in" immediately. They were "opposed" to anything which

_____

(1)   "Fireground" was the term the firemen used - it refers to the physical area of the emergency fire situation.

(2)   This was against Union regulations.

interfered with their ability to turn out quickly. Despite the
advantages or reorganization (and there were some) a large proportio
of the respondents opposed reorganization:

"It'll make it more difficult mobilising-wise, as you're
taking longer not fighting fires but to get your messages through
to control and let them know what's happening. It will take quite
a long time for us to get into the routine."

The City firemen believed that different mobilization
procedures and other facets of reorganization meant that in the new
organization a different orientation to the emergency situations
would have to be adopted. In the larger County fire brigade contro:
over the turn outs was taken out of the hands of the individual
stations. Control at H.Q. notified the firemen when to turn out.
The emergency did not occur on "their patch" but on somebody else's
patch as well.

The respondents told me that in the County Brigade and
the shortly to be formed Reorganized Brigade the individual stations
did not and would not receive the calls direct. These calls were
received first by the control at headquarters which passed the
"orders" on, having decided first how they should be dealt with.
The respondents argued that this resulted in time being lost, and
that this interfered with their ability to do their job.

It can be argued that the County firemen's way of respondin
to the emergencies was thus modified in line with the constraints
their organization faced. The City firemen believed that they had
the "true" fire fighting attitude and that the County firemen's
attitude was less worthy. In particular, the City firemen valued
the element of discretion and autonomy they had to act responsibly
in fire emergency situations. They argued that the County firemen
lacked this freedom and autonomy. I argue that the relative lack o:

constraints in the small City fire brigade enabled a relatively
unmodified "crisis reaction" to the emergency situation to be
developed. The firemen wanted to be able to "get stuck in" and
in the Small Brigade they were not always prevented from doing so.
The resulting "crisis orientation" to work was an important factor
integrating the work group. The work was defined as an emergency
situation which demanded emergency action, and action was based on
this orientation.

The City firemen argued that the more formalized authority
relations of the County Brigade limited the autonomy of the
firemen; they had to wait to be told what to do in the emergency
situation. The City firemen believed that firemen SHOULD know
how to behave in the emergency without being told by an officer.
They also believed that their small brigade (and thus their
attitudes to emergencies) would not be dominant in the new
reorganized fire brigade. New officers would be moved in,
particularly from the County Brigade which "surrounded" them and
these officers would bring "new" attitudes with them. One fireman
argued:

"I don't think I'd like to be put on the same level as
them, because, honestly, they really are poor. It's an affront
to a professional fireman. We've got a good name for fire fighting
which will go. As far as efficiency is concerned it is not going
to be very good. Their general attitudes are different. Take a
house fire, well everybody here, if you took the sub-officer off
the machine and put five firemen on and we rolled up EVERYBODY
would know what to do. Officers are obsolete really. But in
the County they have a situation where you are not allowed to do
anything until you've been detailed to do it. Many a time we've
been in a fire in their area and they just stood there until the
Officer-in-Charge said "OK you do this". But it will take a lot

to push our system out because most of our lads here have had 10-12 years on our system of fire fighting."

"Now we're just beginning to realise how lucky we have been in the past.   We were a very efficient fire brigade.   In our City, in all the years I have been here, to get a five pump fire was a big event.   In other words, we've had plenty of turn outs and yet because the lads do their job and get stuck in right at the start, it's a rare event.   We get in right to the seat of the fire - and its only because the lads get in there quickly before it reaches large proportions.   But their fire fighting methods are entirely different from our own.   If the others turn out to a job the lads from X Brigade stand around and wait.   We did not have to wait to be told.   By the time the officer had come round to tell you you've already started the necessary action.   But in X Brigade that's taboo.   I'm afraid it will affect us.   The majority of the officer set up consists of the old X Brigade Officers

I was not able to examine the objective truth of these attitudes because I did not visit the County Brigade.   The material I have about the County Brigade is entirely based on what the City firemen told me.   They believed that it would be more difficult for the large organization to "behave" in the same way as theirs.   They argued that the larger organization faced a greater number of constraints, and that these constraints had to be taken account of when dealing with emergencies.   They told me that the large brigade had to be more careful about SAFETY in getting to the fire. Whereas minor accidents could be forgotten in the small brigade, in a large brigade (where all accidents were recorded) they would show up as significant in the statistics.   In addition, they believed that in the larger brigade it would be more difficult to ignore the Union's policy on traffic conditions.   The Union urged the

firemen not to take unnecessary risks, unjustifiable accidents could not be condoned. It was therefore difficult "to go through the lights on red". Moreover the "social distance" between the Police and the Fire Brigade would grow. [1]

Blauner in his book "Alienation and Freedom", [2] features, in his empirical analysis, a description of the crisis situation which chemical workers faced at the Bay Chemical Plant. [3] Blauner stresses that the small size of the plant was responsible, to a considerable degree, for the high level of social integration and job satisfaction at the Company. Moreover, the Company made a fairly unified group of products - the goals and problems of the organization could be understood by a large proportion of the workers in the Company. The workers were not isolated because they worked in shifts which had a clear individual identity. The Bay work situation therefore had a number of features in common with the Fire Stations: small size; clearly defined working groups; unified work goals; a short span between the bottom and the top of the organisation; [4] and an anti-crisis orientation which nevertheless had many features in common with the firemen's crisis orientation (the crisis had the effect of unifying the working group). The workers in both situations had a high level of job satisfaction.

A different situation existed, however, at Laporte, the Company investigated by Goldthorpe and Lockwood. The authors state

----

(1) Before the Second World War the police and Fire Service had been closely related. Over the years the two roles had become clearly differentiated. Nevertheless between the small localised forces close contact and good relations had been maintained.

(2) Op. cit.,

(3) The Bay workers did not "look forward" to crisis.

(4) The managers mucked in.

‹ that Laporte was a large Company concerned with making a diverse range of products.   The workers were split up into work groups of two or three, and these groups were physically isolated from one another, and were concerned with very different processes and problems.   The "goals" and products of the Company were more diverse than those of the Bay Company.   Under these circumstances, a crisis orientation [1] did not develop.   The crises had no important role to play in integrating the work group as a whole.

I argue, on the basis of this evidence, that two organization. factors will influence whether or not crises perform integrative functions for the work group, [2] and these factors are organizational size and the number of organizational production goals.

Findings such as these should be treated tentatively as the research is not primarily concerned with comparative crisis situations.   The research is more adequately oriented to the question why the crises and emergencies gave the firemen a high level of job satisfaction.

The "External Relationship of the Emergencies with the Fireman.

I am arguing that the emergencies were not anomic in their effects on the fireman's lifestyle because they were "expected" and "external".

The emergencies were external to the fireman in the sense that they were "somebody else's crises".   Deaths became more internal, however, when the death occurred of someone who, in the fireman's mind, subjectively resembled someone "near at home". For instance, firemen were very upset when children died because

----

(1)   Or an anti-crisis orientation as at Bay.

(2)   Very likely there are many other determinants but these have not emerged from the research.

they often reminded them of their own children.

Death was not "automatically" external to a fireman's consciousness. There was always a danger that the firemen, particularly the new recruits, would become too involved with the accident victim's plight. It was in this context that it was said:

"Seeing stiffs will make or break a fireman."

And it was perhaps because of this, that a certain amount of "callous joking" was legitimated perhaps so that the firemen could detach themselves, momentarily, from the harrowing circumstance that they were sometimes called to deal with. Death was rationalize the death of old persons was, for instance, less painful, because the old persons had "lived their lives anyway".

What I am arguing is that although, in the case of death, fires and emergencies were not completely external to the respondents nevertheless the emergencies did not basically affect the fireman's own position.[1]

The crises then were not really internal to the group. They were external rather than internal. Generally speaking it was "someone else's" crisis". It was someone else's home that was burning down. This is not to say that there was no altruistic motiv behind the firemen's actions. Although being a fireman was less dangerous than being a coal miner or a builder, it was still a dangerous occupation. But nevertheless the emergencies did not swallow up the firemen. As I have argued before, being a fireman was a job which was quite compatible with family life. In some ways one could argue that fire fighting provided many of the satisfactions of military life, without the same level of incompatibility with family roles and without perhaps quite the same level of danger. The altruism of army life prevailed but in a modified form.

_____

(1) Unless the fireman was killed or injured by an emergency.

The fire emergencies themselves thus did not impose sudden changes of lifestyle on the firemen. In fact, they had an opposite effect. They dedicated the men to the worthwhile nature of the tasks they were already performing. The firemen's emergencies were seen to be meaningful. Fire fighting was a meaningful activity which dedicated the firemen further to their existing social relationships.

The Expectedness, the Intrinsic Variety, the Unpredictability and the Unanomic Quality of the Emergencies.

To argue that crises were unpredictable and yet expected is not contradictory. The crises were not unexpected, in the sense that the firemen were trained and oriented solely to dealing with just such emergencies. The emergencies did not therefore come completely as a "bolt from the blue". The emergencies in fact formed the most important part of the fireman's job. Nevertheless the type of emergency and its particular timing was unpredictable. The firemen gained a high level of job satisfaction from dealing with "unpredictable" crises in the context of the "expectedness" of these crises, and from their unanomic character, in relation to the fireman's working identity.

I particularly wanted to find out the way that the firemen valued variety and unpredictability because I perceived a tension between considerations of intrinsic interest and those of organizational efficiency. Not surprisingly questions related to this area drew a mildly hostile response from some of the respondents. I asked the respondents the question:

"Would you prefer it, do you think, if you knew where each fire was to be and when it was to happen?"

The idea was to find out whether the men resented their lack

of control over the temporal and locational aspects of their job.
The answers suggest that lack of prior knowledge over when, and
where a fire is going to be is the situation most of the men prefer.
Here are some of the ways they described it:

"Predictability actually would spoil part of the fun,
because, let's face it, say youre having a good wash, you know, I
know we moan about it but afterwards it's a good laugh really because
you think well, the lousy so and so, caught us at it again. I think
it would spoil it but, by the same rule, you can get jobs where,
alright, they've been nasty and you need a break and a clean up, but
basically you've just not got the men, as well as it would spoil the
fun, you know."

and   "From an operational point of view if you knew the place you
be able to pre-plan, but from a personal point of view I would not
like it".

Generally the men valued the temporal and locational
unpredictability of their job but acknowledged that SOMETIMES
considerations of "enjoyment" and "efficiency" did in fact conflict.
Many of them reacted somewhat defensively by reaffirming my initial
statement that the question was "hypothetical". They did not like
to have to choose between the two considerations and tended to regard
the question as somewhat unnecessary.

Some firemen stressed that the "enjoyment" aspect was most
important to them in some situations at least:

"It would vary on the type of fire. If say, for instance,
it meant a life being saved, definitely. But when I first joined
the job, that was all part of the excitement; granted, most of that
has worn off now but I don't think it would be a very good thing for
the service as a whole if you knew the exact time, where it was

going to be, and what was going to be involved.   You would not be getting, seeing the actual worth of your fire brigade, you follow me? So the unexpected does stretch the capabilities of the chaps concerned."

Unpredictability was valued in itself but job satisfaction was sometimes put first:

"If someone's life was in danger, if you knew the type of fire - you could - it would be useful to know.   But from a personal point of view I would not like to know."

And   "From the job point of view 'yes', you'd know what you have to do.   But 'no' from the 'adventure' side.   I'd never get this adventure anywhere else."

Other firemen simply did not like the idea of knowing 'when' or 'where' a fire was to be:

"It would not be the fire service then - half of it is in the unexpected.   It would take _everything_ out of the job."

And   "If you could plan the day ahead, yes OK, but that's an impossibility.   No fire is the same.   If you think fires are the same you'd make a right mess.   It's an impossibility - never the same situation.   You can have a fire in two houses that are exactly the same, but because one fire has children in and the other has old people in, they go entirely different.   If it was old people we'd be more concerned with keeping smoke out of the room than actually putting out the fire which was under control."

And   "It would not be like it.   It's better turning out seeing what it was.   If you see a fire you start going from there - you're looking at everything that could happen.   You'd be going round waiting all the time.   It's better as it is."

There were a few who liked the thought of predictability,

however:

"Lovely, you'd have some idea of the dangers to watch out
for and what appliances were needed."

And   "I'd like a fixed routine. Then I could plan any activities

Most of the respondents then valued both aspects of
unpredictability in their work - some emphasizing one, and the rest
emphasizing the other.   Both aspects appeared to be of roughly
equal importance to the firemen overall.   Just because the firemen
liked unpredictability it did not mean, however, that there were
not times when it worked to their disadvantage.   I asked the
respondents the question:

"Are there ever times when you dislike going to a fire?"

"If it's something I'm doing in my own time, like watching
TV, I don't want to go to fires, but if it's work routine or drills
then I like fires."

And   "When there's a good programme on - you always 'turn out'
at the crucial point."

"After you've come back they don't say to you, right, you've
got half an hour free of obligation."

"It's not a question of disliking turning out. It's a
question of being uncomfortable.   You might be on the toilet or
asleep - the weather could be bad."

"You can be turned out at any time normally whilst you're
walking about.   But at night (you never get a deep sleep, it's
always shallow unless you are an unusual individual, and obviously
we've got a few who can sleep on clothes lines).   You go to bed and
lie down and you can be out of that bed and dressed and actually
moving away on the fire engine in 20 seconds.   You can't tell me
anybody who can hear a door bell ring in bed and be down to that bell

in half a minute. It sounds a terrible thing to say but firemen can go to an address, they arrive at the address and then you can go to the driver and say how did you come here? Often he will not be able to tell you which way he came. He does not even know where he is for a few seconds. This is because he's never been fully conscious of what he's been doing."

Another firemen said:

"In the middle of the night, 3 a.m. to 5 a.m., this is the worst time. In the first part of the night you are in a light sleep but later this becomes a heavy one."

The emergencies were unpredictable and the firemen valued their unpredictability. They would not have liked to have known about fires in advance, if hypothetically, this was possible.

"It would take everything out of the job."

Moreover, because the effect of fire prevention was to increase control and predictability, many firemen saw the rewards of doing such work as limited and they preferred to remain exclusively involved with each emergency situation as it arose.

"I'd never get this adventure anywhere else."

At the time of the interviews [1] the technology of fire prevention, and the fire prevention legislation had not been extended to cover domestic households. The existing fire prevention legislation covered only factories, hotels, shops and public places. Nevertheless, as the Holroyd Report [2] has pointed out, the majority of deaths from fires occur in the home. Holroyd argues that fire prevention measures in domestic homes which would necessitate entry for the purpose of enforcement is impracticable on the scale required. [3] But since the Holroyd Report was written fire

---

(1) Early 1974.

(2) "Report of the Departmental Committee on the Fire Service", Chairman Sir R. Holroyd, London, H.M.S.O., 1970.

(3) Ibid.

prevention work has become part of the duties of the ordinary ranks and many of the firemen I spoke to said they would prefer to do 'house to house' fire prevention rather than factory fire prevention. Helping to stop deaths in the home was more important to them than stopping factory fires.

In 1974 a fairly effective technology was in operation to assist firemen fight fires on industrial and commercial premises. On this type of premises, at least, automatic fire fighting systems had been brought to a high pitch of reliability. The domestic fires, which were the worst fires from the point of view of the fireman, occurred in circumstances in which humans had a relatively low level of control, because of the absence of automatic fire prevention technology. It remains quite unusual to see a house with its own sprinkler system. Yet despite the fireman's dislike of 'domestic fatals' it must be emphasized that they liked unpredictability. The tension between the fireman's moral dislike of fire situations and the need for job satisfaction remained.

I have said enough to have demonstrated that unpredictability was appreciated. The unpredictability was the cornerstone of the fireman's crisis orientation. If the crises had been completely predictable there would have been no opportunity to act in normally illegitimate ways. The unpredictability of the crisis meant that normally legitimate values could, in the context of the emergency, be subordinated to the need to get to the fire quickly and put it out effectively.

= = = = = = = = = = = =

C O N C L U S I O N

In this concluding chapter I will briefly draw together
the various themes of the earlier chapters.

1.   It has been suggested that the City fireman is a member
of an occupational community of intermediate totality.   It has
been argued that firemen lack the technology to extend work into
leisure.   The work requires a complex technology not available in
non work periods.   Assemblers are in a similar position, but
whereas assemblers have an "instrumental" orientation to work the
firemen have a multi-stranded orientation.   Firemen, whilst being
highly involved in work, are characterized by the separation of
work and leisure in their lives.   Extension is regarded as
unnecessary by the firemen.   There is no need for them to extend
work into leisure.   I have argued that technology is an important
determining variable of the nature of work non-work relationships.
Whereas a policeman can use a telephone to report somebody during
his leisure time (simple unspecialised technology) a fireman would
have little chance of being able to "extend" work into leisure in
a similar way.   A fireman works as a team member and can only work
effectively with the group technology.   An assembler, likewise, is
unable to extend work into leisure without the technology of the
work situation.

2.   The problem "What is an Expressive Orientation to Work?"
has been raised.   I have questioned whether it is sociologically
realistic to view having a family as a choice.   If the firemen
for instance had stayed in the armed services and foregone the
pleasures of family life would this represent a true example of an

expressive orientation?   Or should one take the view that family

life is "normal" and that in consequence the firemen did not really

change their orientation by adapting and changing their occupation

to meet family circumstances?   I have called the fireman's

orientation "multi-stranded", but it must be pointed out that if

the view is taken that firemen HAD to adapt in this way, then it

can be claimed that they still have an expressive orientation to

work.   Alternatively, if the view is taken that having a family

WAS a choice, then it can be argued that the firemen had become

more instrumental, by choosing an occupation which was intrinsically

less total in character, and by becoming family oriented, rather

than becoming work oriented.   The firemen never became totally

instrumental however and an explanation in terms of a "multi-

stranded" orientation takes account of the fact that the firemen

made a minimal move towards instrumentation as they assumed family

responsibilities.   Their prior orientations to work were not

completely abandoned.   They did not sacrifice intrinsic satisfactions

to the extent of wishing to go and work in a factory.

3.   The salient qualities of the fireman's emergency situation

have been evaluated with a view to answering the question: "Why do

emergencies give meaning and a high level of job satisfaction?"

It was found that the emergencies were unanomic in character, from

the fireman's point of view, but that they nevertheless afforded

opportunities for adventure, unpreditability and variety.

4.   The research findings have implicitly questioned Blauner's

conclusions that technology alone is responsible for the Bay

Chemical Workers' high level of job satisfaction.   It has been

shown that a definition of crisis (which is likely to be found in

organizations small in size and oriented to one goal) is an
important variable with regard to job satisfaction. The explanation
for the high level of job satisfaction of firemen and the Bay
Chemical Workers that I have put forward is in conflict with
Blauner's, to the extent that Blauner linked level of job
satisfaction in his conclusion exclusively to technological variables.
Integrative emergencies occurring in the context of the small group
are not necessarily dependent on the nature of any one particular
type of technology, as the differences in examples of firemen and
chemical process workers show. I have indicated, however, that
the sociology of crisis situations is a subject about which
relatively little is known. My findings in this area should
therefore be considered as tentative probings.

= = = = = = = = = = =

APPENDIX A: THE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE [1]

Section 1: Work History.

1.   How old are you?

2.   How long have you worked in this station?

3.   How long have you worked in the Fire Service?

4.   Would you tell me about your career?

Occupation	Employer	Place of Employment	Dates	Reasons for Leaving

5.   If you had the opportunity, would you change the type of work you do?

6.   Do you expect to continue being a fireman for the rest of your life?

Section 2: The Fireman and his Job.

1.   Which kinds of fires do you like attending most?

2.   Which kinds of fires do you like attending least?

3.   What are the things about the job that you most like?

4.   What are the things about the job that you most dislike?

5.   Do you regard the job of fire fighting as:
   a) difficult   Why?
   b) responsible?   Why?
   c) skilled?   Why?
   d) dangerous?   Why?

- -

[1]   Sections 1, 2 and 3 were taped.   Section 4 on Leisure is a questionnaire and the answers were written by the firemen onto the schedules after the main part of the interview.

6.   What do you think people in general think about fireman and their job?

7.   What do you like about working in this station?

8.   What do you dislike about working in this station?

9.   Do you think the pay is high enough for a job like yours?

10.   If you were offered more pay to go and work in a factory, would you go and work in one?

11.   Would you enjoy it if you went out to fires, one after the other, continuously?

12.   What effect does having to suddenly get up and go to a fire have on the other activities you are doing?

13.   Would you prefer it, do you think, if you knew where each fire was to be, and when it was to happen?

14.   Do you ever find yourself waiting for a fire?

15.   Are there ever times when you dislike going to a fire?

16.   When you get home do you like to talk about the fires or do you try to forget about fires and do something different?

17.   At the end of the shift do you usually wish to get off home, or do you feel a wish to wait for another fire?

18.   What jobs are comparable in status to being a fireman do you think?

19.   Do you have much contact with firemen from other stations? Where do you meet them?

20.   Do you see "mates" from the fire station regularly after work?   How often?   Where?

21.   When you see "mates" from the station after work, does your wife usually come along?

22.   Would you say that most of your friends now are in the Fire Service?

          Most in Fire Service

          Most outside Fire Service

          About half and half

          Other

23.   How would you feel if you were moved to another station more or less like this one, but away from the men who work near you.   Would you feel:

          very upset   fairly upset

          not much bothered   not bothered at all

24. Here are some of the things often thought important about a job: which one would you look for first in a job? And which next?

25. How often do you go to Union Meetings?

regularly   occasionally   rarely   never

26. How often do you attend work based clubs or activities?

regularly   occasionally   rarely   never

27. Do you like or dislike the actual job of being a fireman? Would you say that:

you like it a lot

you (merely) like it

you dislike it a lot

you (merely) dislike it

you neither like nor dislike it.

28. From what you know or may have heard about factory work is there anything you consider attractive or unattractive about factory work?

Attractive   Unattractive

29. How do you think your job compares with factory work?

Better   Why?

Same   Why?

Worse   Why?

30. Have you ever worked in a factory?

31. If you were not a fireman what other jobs would you like to do?

Section 3:   Family and Social Life.

1. Are you single, married or widowed?

2. Do you have any children?

(If yes)

3. How old are your children?

4. If married, does your wife go out to work?

a) full time

b) part time

c) not at all

5.   Do you agree with your wife going out to work?

6.   What does your wife say about your being a fireman?

7.   Does your wife like you being in the Fire Service?

   Yes

   No

   Mixed feelings / never known anything else

   Don't know

8.   (If likes Fire Service) What does your wife like about
   your being in the Fire Service?

   (If does not like Fire Service) What does she dislike
   about your being in the Fire Service?

9.   Has your wife said she wished you could get a different job
   outside the Fire Service?

   Yes

   No

   Don't know

10.   (If yes) Do you think she (ever) meant it seriously
   at the time?

11.   What effect do you think being a fireman has on your family life?

12.   What tasks do you prefer to do in the 'off' duty days?

13.   Does your wife ever say whether she prefers you to stay at
   home in the 'off' period, or get a job.
   (If yes) Which does she prefer?

   a)   prefers him to stay at home

   b)   prefers him to get extra job

14.   (If does extra job) What effect do you think doing an extra
   job has on family life?

   (If does not get an extra job) Why do you not do an extra job?

15.   Do you belong to any political or religious group, or to
   a Trade Union?

16.   Do you think that firemen ought to be married or single?

17.   I know its difficult but could you try to think back and tell
   me what were the main things you did on your last two days
   'off' (get people, etc.) (is he a fireman, friend or
   relative).

18.   What were the main things you did on the two days before you
   came on night shift?

19. If not typical, what else do you do? What does your wife do when you are doing these activities?

20. How about your neighbours - how much do you see of them (ask about either side of the house)

21. Do you know what they do? (i.e. their occupation)

22. Who would you say are the two or three people that you spend your spare time with (make clear apart from spouse and children):

        a)   Name and relationship

        b)   How did you get to know him/her?

        c)   How long have you known him/her?

        d)   Where does he/she live?

        e)   What kind of work does he/she and spouse do?

23. Do you have any good friends you see less often, for some reason or another? (school friends, men in the services).

24. (If yes)   When do you see them?

                  Where do they live?

                  What sort of work do they do?

                  How did you get to know them?

25. Who would you say are the two or three people that your wife spends most of her spare time with? (apart from you and the children)

        a)   Name and relationship

        b)   How did she get to know him/her?

        c)   How long have you known him/her?

        d)   Where does he/she live?

        e)   What kind of work does he/she do?

26. Does she have any friends she sees less often for some reason or other?

27. If yes: When does she see them?

                  Where do they live?

                  What sort of work do they do?

                  How did you get to know them?

28. We've been talking about your friends and your spare time activities - how about having other couples round, say for a meal or just for the evening: how often would you do this on average?

Continued ....

(28 cont ...)

> 4 days out of 6
>
> twice a week
>
> once a week
>
> every fortnight
>
> once a month
>
> occasionally

29. (If ever) When did you last do this?

30. Who is it you have round - are they friends, or relatives or who? (list by name, and get occupations).

31. Now here's one about just you and your wife: how often would you say you have an evening out together on average?

> 4 days out of 6
>
> twice a week
>
> once a week
>
> every fortnight
>
> once a month
>
> occasionally

32. (If ever) What sort of things do you usually do?

33. How about family outings with the children: about how often would you say you have one on average?

34. Do you belong to any clubs or organisations or anything like that? Here's a list to show what kind of thing we mean: these are only examples.

35. (Where relevant) About how often do you go it it?

36. Do you hold an official position in any other body?

37. Are there any clubs or societies that you have ever wanted to join but did not?

Section 4: The Leisure Questionnaire. (1)

1.   Out of all the abilities you possess, how many do you use
      in your present job?

      Most

      Some   Please tick
                                            appropriate
      Only a few   answer

2.   To what extent do you normally use the above abilities in
      your job?

      I use them in a superficial way   Please tick

      I use them in a general way   appropriate
                                            answer
      I use them in quite an intensive way

3.   When changes have to be made or difficult problems solved
      which of the following would apply in your job?

      Superior decides without consultation
      with men

      Superior decides after consultation   Please tick
      with men   appropriate
                                            answer
      Decisions taken at a meeting of all
      involved

      You make your own decisions

4.   By what means do you think people get ahead in your
      kind of work?

      Working and studying hard?
                                            Please tick
      Being approved of by right people?   appropriate
                                            answer
      Seniority?

      Other reasons?

5.   If you could choose any occupations regardless of money
      what would you choose?

      a)   Same job
                                            Please tick
      b)   Similar job   appropriate
                                            answer
      c)   Different job

      If you have ticked b) or c), please state what
      job you would choose.

      The occupation I would choose is ....
      ....

— —

(1)   After the interview the firemen were asked to write the
      replies to the questionnaire (Section 4) themselves.
      Therefore this section was not taped.

6. How many hours of leisure do you normally have per week?

<table>
<tr><td>1 - 10</td><td rowspan="4">Please tick
appropriate
answer</td></tr>
<tr><td>10 - 20</td></tr>
<tr><td>20 - 30</td></tr>
<tr><td>30 - 40</td></tr>
</table>

7. During the last week how many hours of leisure have you spent with your family, work colleagues, other friends and by yourself?

<table>
<tr><td>With family</td><td rowspan="4">Please write
number of hours
for each</td></tr>
<tr><td>With work colleagues</td></tr>
<tr><td>With other friends</td></tr>
<tr><td>By yourself</td></tr>
</table>

= = = = = = =

APPENDIX B: TYPES OF PREMISES DEALT WITH BY A CITY FIRE BRIGADE[*]

	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG.	SEPT.	OCT.	NOV.	DEC.	TOTALS
Private Houses	28	33	21	14	17	13	29	28	24	207
Multi Storey Flats	2	0	1	4	5	3	2	8	3	28
Factories	6	10	6	5	5	5	3	3	2	45
Shops	6	4	5	2	1	6	2	1	1	28
Garages	3	0	4	1	3	0	2	1	3	17
Open Roadway	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2
Hospitals	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	2	6
Clubs	2	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	5
Enclosed Ground (Roadway)	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3
Motor Vehicles	4	5	6	3	5	9	5	3	7	47
Open Ground	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	4
Post Boxes	3	3	1	3	2	2	2	1	0	17
Warehouses	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	3
Schools	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	2	1	8
Licenced Victuallers	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	4
	58	57	46	37	42	41	52	47	44 c/f	424

[*]   This data applies to the City Brigade I visited, and is calculated over a nine month period.
(April 1973 - Dec. 1973).

161.

Appendix B Cont ...

	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG.	SEPT.	OCT.	NOV.	DEC.	TOTALS
	58	57	46	37	42	41	52	47	44 b/f	424
Docks	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4
Huts	7	3	0	0	2	0	2	1	3	18
Caravans	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Nurses Homes	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Ships	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
University	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4
Derelict Buildings	85	77	78	71	64	53	40	38	23	529
Grassland	37	11	13	6	3	4	0	2	0	76
Fences and Hoardings	3	4	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	11
Refuse and Rubbish	137	106	115	67	133	119	237	123	60	1097
R. Furniture	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	3
Launderettes	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Railway Wagons	0	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	1	6
Electrical Sub Stations	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Bingo Halls	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Lamp Standards	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	1
TOTALS	333	264	255	186	246	220	332	212	132	2180 (Total of all calls)

APPENDIX C: THE INCIDENCE OF CALLS DEALT WITH BY A CITY FIRE BRIGADE.*

TIME	APR.	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG.	SEPT.	OCT.	NOV.	DEC.	TOTALS
Mid – 01	8	4	11	10	9	2	7	4	9	64
01 – 02	3	6	4	2	6	2	4	4	4	35
02 – 03	2	6	5	1	7	4	1	4	1	31
03 – 04	7	4	1	6	3	2	2	2	2	29
04 – 05	2	1	1	1	2	2	0	0	1	10
05 – 06	2	2	0	2	1	0	3	3	1	14
06 – 07	2	1	2	2	1	0	0	1	2	11
07 – 08	4	1	1	1	2	2	7	4	1	23
08 – 09	6	4	5	3	1	4	6	2	2	33
09 – 10	7	10	3	9	7	9	8	5	5	63
10 – 11	16	12	12	5	15	10	7	5	4	86
11 – 12	14	7	12	13	19	6	7	6	6	90
12 – 13	15	20	16	13	8	9	24	11	14	130
13 – 14	21	20	19	13	19	11	23	26	11	163
14 – 15	35	22	23	29	31	19	15	22	23	219
15 – 16	23	30	21	21	21	16	26	27	25	210
16 – 17	26	24	19	20	25	18	31	23	26	212
17 – 18	28	12	20	19	24	31	32	33	22	221
18 – 19	44	34	22	16	35	21	48	31	23	274
19 – 20	38	50	32	22	31	44	66	25	16	324
20 – 21	37	32	32	23	27	34	48	22	16	271
21 – 22	28	32	40	16	45	27	32	22	10	252
22 – 23	28	29	26	7	22	29	28	14	12	195
23 – 24	16	13	25	11	16	11	10	20	7	129
Totals	412	376	352	265	377	313	435	316	243	3089 (total of all calls)

* This data applies to the City Fire Brigade I visited, and is calculated over a nine month period
(April 1973 – Dec. 1973)

REFERENCES

ANDERSON, J.R.L., "The Ulysses Factor: The Exploring Instinct in Man", London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1970.

ARGYRIS. C., "The Applicability of Organizational Sociology", Cambridge University Press, 1972.

BAKER, G.W. and CHAPMAN, D.W., "Man and Society in Disaster", New York, Basic Books, 1962.

BALDAMUS, W., "Efficiency and Effort", London, Tavistock, 1961.

BANKS, J.A., "Industrial Participation", Liverpool University Press, 1953.

BANTON, M., "The Policeman in the Community", London, Tavistock, 1964.

BARTON, A.H., et al., "Social Organization under Stress: A Sociological Review of Disaster Studies", Washington, D.C., National Academy of Sciences, 1963.

BERGER, P.L. (ed.) "The Human Shape of Work", New York, Macmillen, 1964.

BERGER, P.L. and LINKMANN, T., "The Social Construction of Reality", New York, Doubleday, 1966.

BETTELHEIM, B., "Individual and Mass Behaviour in Extreme Situations", Journal of Abnormal Psychology, XXXVIII, 1943, page 417-52.

BEYNON, H. and BLACKBURN, R.M., "Perceptions at Work: Variations within a Factory", Cambridge University Press, 1972.

BLAUNER, R., "Alienation and Freedom: the Factory Worker and his Industry", Chicago University Press, 1964.

BRODY, E.B. (ed.) "Behaviour in New Environments", New York, Sage Publications, 1960.

BROWN, J.A.C. "The Social Psychology of Industry", Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1964.

BROWN, R. and BRENNEN, P., "Social Relations and Social Perspectives amongst Shipbuilding Workers", in Sociology, Vol. 4, 1970, pages 197-211.

BROWN, R., "Sources of Objectives in Work and Employment", in Child, J., (ed.) "Plan and Organization", London, Allen Burns & Unwin, 1973, pages 17-38.

BURNS, N.M., CHAMBER, R.H. and HENDLER, E., (eds.) "Unusual Environments and Human Behaviour" New York, Free Press, 1963.

BURNS, T., (ed.) "Industrial Man", Penguin, 1967.

BURNS, T. and STALKER, G.M., "Management of Innovations",
    London, Tavistock, 1961.

CAIN, M.,   "On the Beat: Interactions and Relations in
    Rural and Urban Police", in Cohen, S., (ed.)
    "Images of Deviance", Harmondsworth,
    Penguin, 1971.

CANNON, I.C., "Ideology and Occupational Community: A Study
    of Compositors", Sociology, Vol. 1, 1967.

CHINOY, E.,   "Automobile Workers and the American Dream",
    New York, Doubleday, 1955.

DAVIS, A.,   "The Motivation of the Underprivileged Worker",
    in Whyte, W.F., (ed.), "Industry and Society",
    New York, McGraw Hill, 1946.

DEGRAZIA, S., "Of Time, Work and Leisure",
    New York, Twentieth Century, 1962.

DENNIS, N., HENRIQUES, F. and SLAUGHTER, C.,
    "Coal is Our Life", London, Eyre and
    Spottiswood, 1956.

DENZIN, N.K., "Pharmacy - Incomplete Professionalization",
    in Social Forces, Vol. 46, No.3, 1968.

DESMOND, C., "The Discarded People", Harmondsworth,
    Penguin, 1971.

DORNBUSCH, S.M., "The Military Academy as an Assimilating
    Institution", in Social Forces, 33: 317, 1955.

DUBIN, R.,   "Industrial Workers' Worlds: A Study of the
    Central Life Interests of Industrial Workers".

DUMAZEDIER, J., "Current Problems in the Sociology of Leisure",
    International Social Science Journal,
    No.4, 1960.

DUMAZEDIER, J., "Towards a Society of Leisure", London,
    Collier - Macmillan, 1967.

DURKHEIM, E., "The Rules of the Sociological Method",
    London, The Free Press, 1964.

DURKHEIM, E., "Suicide: A Study in Sociology", London,
    Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1972.

DURKHEIM, E., "Some Notes on Occupational Groups" in
    "The Division of Labour", page 1-31, Glencoe,
    Illinois, Free Press, 1947.

ELDRIDGE, J.E.T.,   "The Demarcation Dispute in the Shipbuilding
                     Industry", in Eldridge, J.E.T., "Industrial
                     Disputes",   London,   Routledge and
                     Kegan Paul,   1968.

ELIAS, N. and DUNNING, E.,   "The Quest for Excitement in Unexciting
                     Societies",   Paper presented to the British
                     Sociological Association Conference,
                     London,   1967.

ETZIONI, A.,   "Modern Organizations",   New Jersey,
                     Prentice Hall,   1970.

ETZIONI, A.,   "A Comparative Analysis of Complex
                     Organizations",   Glencoe,   Free Press,   1961.

FAUNCE, W.A.,   "Problems of an Industrial Society",
                     New York,   McGraw-Hill,   1968.

FAUNIE, W.A.,   "Readings in Industrial Sociology",   New York,
                     Meredith Publishing,   1967.

FRANKENBERG, R.,   "Communities in Britain: Social Life in Town
                     and Country",   Harmondsworth,   Penguin, 1966.

FRITZ, C.E.,   "Disaster",   in Merton, R.K. and Nisbet R.A. (eds.)
                     "Contemporary Social Problems",
                     London,   Hart-Davies,   1963.

GIDDENS, A.,   "Capitalism and Modern Social Theory",
                     Cambridge University Press,   1971.

GLASER, B. and STRAUSS, A.,   "The Discovery of Grounded Theory:
                     Strategies for Qualitative Research", London,
                     Weidenfield and Nicholson,   1967.

GOFFMAN, E.,   "Asylums",   Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1968.

GOFFMAN, E.,   "Frontiers: Two Studies in the Sociology of
                     Interaction",   New York, Bobs-Merrill, 1967.

GOFFMAN, E.,   "The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life",
                     New York,   Doubleday,   1959.

GOFFMAN, E.,   "Where the Action Is", London, Ellen Lane, 1969.

GOLDTHORPE, J.H.   "Attitudes and Behaviour of Car Assembly
                     Workers: a Deviant Case and Theoretical Critique",
                     British Journal of Sociology, Vol. 17,
                     1966.   Pages 227-241.

GOLDTHORPE, J.H.   "The Social Action Approach to Industrial
                     Sociology - a Reply to Daniel",   Journal of
                     Management Studies, Vol. 7, No.2,
                     May, 1970,   pages 199-208.

GOLDTHORPE, J.H.,   LOCKWOOD, D.,   BECHHOFER, H. and PLATT, T.,
                   "The Affluent Worker: Industrial Attitudes
                   and Behaviour", Cambridge University
                   Press, 1968.

GOLDTHORPE, J.H.,   LOCKWOOD, D.,   BECHHOFER, F. and PLATT, T.
                   "The Affluent Worker in the Class Structure",
                   Cambridge University Press, 1971.

GOULDNER, A.W.   "Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy: A Case
                    Study of Modern Factory Administration",
                    London, The Free Press, 1954.

GOULDNER, A.W.,   "Wildcat Strike", New York, Harper, 1965.

HERZBERG, F.,   MAUSNER, B.,   SNYDERMAN, B.B.,   "The Motivation
                 to Work", New York, Wiley, 1959.

HERZBERG, F.,   "Work and the Nature of Man", London,
                    Staples, 1968.

HERZOG, M.,   "Annapurna", London, Cape, 1952.

HOBLEY, L.F.,   "The Fire Service", London, Allan and Sons, 1970.

HOGGART, R.,   "The Uses of Literacy", Harmondsworth,
                    Penguin, 1958.

HOLLOWELL, P.,   "The Lorry Driver", London, Routledge and
                    Kegan Paul, 1968.

HOLROYD, R.,   "Report of the Departmental Committee on the
                    Fire Service", London, H.M.S.O., 1970.

HORTON, J.,   "Alienation and Anomie", British Journal of
                    Sociology, 13, 1964.

INGHAM, G.,   "Organizational Size, Orientation to Work
                    and Industrial Behaviour", Cambridge
                    University Press, 1967.

JANOINTZ, M.,   "The Professional Soldier", Glencoe, Illinois,
                    Free Press, 1960.

KILLIAN, L.,   "The Significance of Multiple Group Membership
                    in Disaster", American Journal of Sociology,
                    LVII, 1952, pages 309-14.

LIPSET, S.M.,   TROW, M.A. and COLEMAN, J.S. "Union Democracy:
                    The Internal Politics of the International
                    Typographical Union", Glencoe, Illinois, Free Press.

LIVERPOOL DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICE, "The Dock Worker",
                    Liverpool University Press, 1954.

LOCKWOOD, D.,   "The Blackcoated Worker, London,
                       Allen and Unwin, 1958.

LUPTON, T.,   "On the Shop Floor", Oxford, Pergammon, 1963.

MASLOW, A.H.,   "Motivation and Personality", New York,
                       Harper, 1954.

McGREGOR, D.,   "The Human Side of Enterprise", New York,
                       McGraw Hill, 1960.

MOSS, L. and PARKER, S.D., "The Local Government Councillor",
                       London, H.M.S.O., 1967.

MILLS, C.W.,   "The Sociological Imagination", London,
                       Oxford University Press, 1959.

MONZELIS, N.R.   "Organization and Bureaucracy", London,
                       Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1967.

MORSE, N.,   "Satisfaction in the White Collar Job",
                       University of Michigan, 1953.

PARKER, S.,   "The Future of Work and Leisure",
                       London, Paladin, 1972.

PARKER, S.,   "Type of Work, Friendship Pattern and Leisure",
                       Human Relations, Vol. 17, No.3, 1964.

PARKER, S.,   "Work and Non-Work in Three Occupations",
                       Sociological Review, Vol. 13, No.1, 1965.

PARKIN, F.,   "Class Inequality and Political Order",
                       London, MacGibbon and Kee, 1971.

POGGI, G.,   "A Mass Theme of Contemporary Sociological
                       Analysis: Its Achievements and Limitations",
                       British Journal of Sociology, Vol. 16, 1965.

POLSKY, N.,   "Hustlers, Beats and Others", Harmondsworth,
                       Penguin, 1971.

PRANDY, K.,   "Professional Employees", London, Falser, 1965.

PUGH, D.S. (ed.)   "Organination Theory", Harmondsworth,
                       Penguin, 1971.

PUGH, D.S., HICKSON, D.J. and HININGS, C.R.,
                       "Writers on Organizations", Harmondsworth,
                       Penguin, 1971.

REX, J.,   "Key Problems of Sociological Theory", London,
                       Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1961.

RICE, A.K.   "The Enterprise and Its Environment",
                       London, Tavistock, 1963.

ROETHLISBERGER, F.J. and DICKSON, W.,
"Management and the Worker", Cambridge, Mass.
Harvard, 1939.

SACKS, H.,   "An Initial Investigation of the Usability of
Conversational Data for Doing Sociology" in
Sudnow, D., (ed.), "Studies in Social
Interaction", New York, Free Press, 1972.

SALAMAN, G. and THOMPSON, K., (eds.)
"People and Organizations", London, Longman, 1973.

SALAMAN, G.,   "Some Principal Determinants of Occupational
Communities", in Sociological Review,
Vol. 19, No.1, Feb., 1971.

SALAMAN, G.,   "Two Occupational Communities: Examples of
a Remarkable Convergence of Work and Non-Work",
in The Sociological Review, Vol. 19, No.3,
Aug. 1971.

SALAMAN, G.,   "Occupations, Community and Consciousness",
in Bulmer, M (ed.), "Studies in Working
Class Imagery", London, Routledge and
Kegan Paul, 1973.

SALAMAN, G.,   "Community and Occupation: An Exploration of
Work - Leisure Relationships", Cambridge
University Press, 1974.

SCHUTZ, A.,   "Collected Papers", (3rd Volume),
M. Natanson (ed.), The Hague, Nijhoff, 1964.

SMIGEL, E.O.,   "Work and Leisure", College and University
Press Services, 1963.

SMITH, M.A., PARKER, S. and SMITH, C., (eds.)
"Leisure and Society in Britain", London,
Allen Lane, Penguin Press, 1973.

SMITH, M.A.,   "Anti-Leisure",   forthcoming.

SOLZENITSYN, A., "One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovitch",
Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1968.

STACY, M.,   "The Myth of Community Studies", British
Journal of Sociology, Vol. 40, No.2, 1969.

SUTHERLAND, E.,   "The Professional Thief",   Chicago,
Chicago University Press, 1937.

SYKES, A.T.M.,   "Navvies: Their Work Attitudes", in
Sociology, Vol. 3, 1969.

SYKES, A.T.M.,   "Navvies: Their Social Relations", in
Sociology, Vol. 3, 1969.

SZALAI, A.,   "Differential Evaluation of Time Budgets for
                       Corporation Purposes", in Merritt, D.L. and
                       Rokkan, S., (eds.), "Comparing Nations",
                       New Haven, Yale University Press, 1966.

THOMAS, M.,   "The Fire Service and its Personnel", London,
                       H.M.S.O., 1969.

THOMAS, W.L. and ZNANIECKI, F.,
                       "The Polish Peasant in Europe and America",
                       2nd edn., 2 vols., New York, Dover, 1958.

TONNIES, F.,   "Community and Association", London,
                       Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1955.

TOURAINE, A.,   "Workers' Attitudes to Technical Change",
                       O. E. C. P., 1965.

TUNSTALL, J.,   "The Fishermen: The Sociology of an Extreme
                       Occupation", London, MacGibbon and Kee, 1969.

TUNSTALL, J. and CURRAN, J.,
                       "Mass Media and Leisure", in Smith M.A. et
                       al., (eds.), "Leisure and Society in Britain"
                       op. cit.

VEBLEN, J.,   "The Theory of the Leisure Class", London,
                       Allen and Unwin, 1925.

VIDRICH, A. and BENSMAN, J.,
                       "Small Town in Mass Society", Princeton, N.J.
                       Princeton University Press, 1958.

WALKER, C.R. and GUEST, R.,
                       "The Man on the Assembly Line", New York,
                       McGraw Hill, 1952.

WALKER, C.R., GUEST, R. and TURNER, A.N.,
                       "The Foreman on the Assembly Line",
                       Cambridge Mass., University of Harvard, 1952.

WALLACE, A.F.,   "Human Behaviour in Extreme Situations",
                       Washington, D.C., National Academy of
                       Science, 1956.

WEBER, M.,   "The Theory of Social and Economic Organization,
                       New York, Free Press, 1964.

WELFORD, A.T. et al. (eds.) "Society: Problems and Methods of Study",
                       London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1962.

WESTERGAARD, J.,   "The Rediscovery of the Cash Nexus", in the
                       Socialist Register, London. The Merlin Press.

WHYTE, W.H.,   "The Organization Man", Simon and Schuster, 1961.

WILENSKY, H.L.,   "The Uneven Distribution of Leisure: The Impact
                   of Economic Growth on Free Time", in Social
                   Problems, 1961.

WILENSKY, H.L.   "Work, Careers and Social Integration",
                   International Social Science Journal,
                   No.4, 1960.

WOODWARD, J.,   "Management and Technology", London,
                   H. M. S. O., 1958.

WOODWARD, J.,   "Industrial Behaviour: Is There a Science?"
                   New Society, 8th Oct., 1964.

WOODWARD, J.,   "Industrial Organization: Theory and Practice",
                   London, Oxford University Press, 1965.

WRONG, D.,   "The Oversocialized Concept of Man", in
                   Demerth and Peterson (eds.), "System, Change and
                   Conflict", New York, Free Press, 1967.

YOUNG, J.,   "The Role of the Police as Amplifiers of
                   Deviancy ...", in Cohen, S., (ed.), "Images
                   of Deviance", Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1971.

ZWEIG, F.,   "The Worker in an Affluent Society", London,
                   Heinemann, 1961.

ZWEIG, F.,   "The British Worker",   Harmondsworth,
                   Penguin, 1952.

= = = = = = = = = = = =